

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

VOL. IX—JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1918—No. 3

THE COMPOSITION OF THE OLD FRENCH PROSE *LANCELOT*.—I

J'ay leu . . . LANCELOT, le tresplaisant menteur.—Clément Marot, *Élégie XVI*.

THE opinion that the Old French prose *Lancelot* is a composite work has been pretty generally expressed in one form or another, although, as a rule, very vaguely, by scholars who have occupied themselves especially with the prose romances. Apropos of the magic ring which had the power of increasing love and which the damsel of "l'estroite marche" gave Hector on parting and in view of the fact that nothing more is heard in the narrative of this damsel and the ring (Hector becoming involved afterward in other *amours*), Paulin Paris remarks that the episode¹ proves that the prose *Lancelot* was composed "de laisses (ou plutôt de lais) recueillies de diverses parts, sans lien des unes avec les autres."² In *La littérature française au moyen âge* (first edition,

¹ It will be found in H. O. Sommer's *The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, III, 351. This work (7 volumes, plus Index) was published at Washington, D. C., for the Carnegie Institution of Washington. Vol. I (*Estoire del Saint Graal*, often called *Grand St. Graal*) is dated 1909 and Vol. II (*Merlin*) 1908. Both really appeared in 1910. Vols. III (1910), IV (1911), and V (1912) contain the *Lancelot*. This is the first edition of the complete romance since the sixteenth century. Vol. VI (1913) contains the *Queste del Saint Graal* and *La Mort le Roi Artus* (or *Mort Artu*), and Vol. VII (1913) the *Livre d'Artus* of MS. 337 (Bibliothèque Nationale). All my references to these romances will be to Sommer's edition, unless otherwise stated. Henceforth, for brevity's sake, I will omit in my references his name and the general title of the work. Sommer's division of the *Lancelot* into three Parts has no authority in the text itself.

² *Romans de la Table Ronde*, III, 376, note, 5 vols., Paris, 1868-1877. I will henceforth cite this work, as a rule, merely by the author's name. Moreover, IV, 208, note, he expresses the opinion that the episode of Gawain and Carados the Giant did not belong to the *Lancelot* in its original form—so, too, V, 167, note, with the episode of Bors (Bohort) with Brangoire's daughter. Cf. still further, IV, 137, note, V, 358.

Paris, 1888), 101 f., G. Paris speaks of the "*Lancelot en prose primitif*"—which, according to his assumption, was connected with the *Perlesvaus* in Grail matters—as having been recast into a "seconde rédaction" (the *Lancelot* of the extant MSS.), in which the Galahad *Queste* has taken the place of the *Perlesvaus*.³ Otherwise, I do not find that G. Paris has expressed himself more definitely on the subject. R. Heinzel⁴ also indicates certain modifications which the original *Lancelot* underwent on being combined with the *Queste*. A similar view is expressed in general terms by E. Wechssler,⁵ and by Miss J. L. Weston.⁶ Miss Weston⁷ supposes, also, that the rôle of Bohort was amplified in successive redactions of the *Lancelot*. Furthermore, G. Gröber⁸ assigns the *Charete* section and the sections that precede and follow it to three different authors, respectively. E. Brugger⁹ observes that "der ungeheure Lancelotroman hat natürlich eine lange Evolution hinter sich," and that the differences between the *Lancelot* as an independent romance and in the cyclic form (the latter being the only form in which we possess it) are greatest in the so-called *Agravaïn* section (Part III of *Lancelot* and Vol. V in Sommer's series), owing to the efforts of the redactor of the cycle to make it fit with the *Queste* and *Mort Artu* that follow.¹⁰ Brugger regards as interpolations, moreover, the story of the conception and *enserrement* of Merlin¹¹—also,¹² the False Guinevere episode, the interpretation of

³ This view, which has been commonly held, that a *Perceval Queste* once occupied the place in the prose cycle which in our extant MSS. is occupied by the Galahad *Queste*, I have combatted in the *ROMANIC REVIEW*, IV, 462 ff. (1913) and in *Modern Philology*, XV (1918). The opinion which G. Paris thus expresses in the first edition of his *Manuel* is repeated in all subsequent editions.

⁴ *Über die französischen Gralromane* (Vienna, 1892), pp. 159 f.

⁵ *Die Sage vom Heiligen Gral* (Halle, 1898), p. 128.

⁶ *Legend of Sir Lancelot* (London, 1901), pp. 137 ff.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 143 ff.

⁸ *Grundriss*, Band II, Abteilung I, pp. 996 ff. (1901).

⁹ *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Litteratur*, XXXVI, 208 (1910). This opinion, with which I agree, appears to conflict with that which is expressed by the same scholar, XXIX, 86 (1906). There he says that the pre-cyclic *Lancelot* was doubtless pretty nearly identical with the *Lancelot* of our MSS., barring some interpolations in the latter.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 205 f.

¹¹ Cf. *ibid.*, XXX, 175 ff.

¹² *Ibid.*, XXX, 208, XXXI, 251 f. and 252 f., respectively.

Galahad's dreams and the Morgan-Guiomar episode. In his introduction, pp. xvi f., to *The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, I, Sommer declares that internal evidence proves that the *Lancelot*, "as found in the Vulgate cycle," is not the work of one man.¹³

Aside from the internal evidence here referred to (though not specified), which we shall examine in the present article, one would naturally be inclined *a priori* to regard as composite this huge romance, which in Sommer's edition fills 1195 large quarto pages, and so exceeds in bulk the four other members of the cycle combined (1140 pages in Sommer's edition). For the *Lancelot*, in its original form, is generally accepted as the earliest of the Arthurian romances in prose, with the possible exception of the brief prose renderings of Robert de Borron's *Joseph* and *Merlin*¹⁴—that is to say, as the earliest specimen of prose fiction in any of the great literary languages of Modern Europe.¹⁵ Now, the e is not the

¹³ We are not concerned here with the statement which Sommer adds as to how the Vulgate cycle was evolved. It includes, among other things, the familiar theory that the Galahad *Queste* of our MSS. has been substituted for an earlier Perceval *Queste*. As I have already said in a note above, I have combatted this theory in the articles there mentioned. Apart from this, however, Sommer's assertion that "it is not difficult to distinguish the old stock of the romance from later additions and modifications," will, I believe, strike any one who has actually tried to make the division in a definite form as decidedly overconfident.

In combatting the Perceval *Queste* theory, referred to above, in the ROMANIC REVIEW, IV, 462 ff., I overlooked the fact that Brugger, *Zs. f. fr. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXIX, 81, in framing his theory, not only substitutes an hypothetical *Perlesvaus* for the actual *Perlesvaus*, but an hypothetical *Mort Arthur* for the *Mort Arthur* (*Mort Artu*) of our MSS.—more specifically, one with Guinevere left out. But every version of the theme in existence, from Geoffrey down, has Guinevere in it. When the author of a theory has to resort to such assumptions as these, comment is superfluous.

¹⁴ I exclude the *Didot-Perceval*, which some scholars accept as a prose-rendering of an hypothetical lost *Perceval* poem by Robert de Borron. In any event, this romance, too, is comparatively short—shorter than the prose-rendering of de Borron's *Merlin* (Sommer, II, 3-88)—it fills only 104 small octavo pages in Miss Weston's edition, *Legend of Sir Perceval*, II, even if we include the disputed *Mort Arthur* section.

¹⁵ France, of course, led the way in the development of prose fiction, yet French prose of any kind only commences in the last years of the twelfth century. See on the subject Gröber's *Grundriss*, Band II, Abteilung I, pp. 718 ff. (1901), and Paul Meyer, *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XXXIII, 379 f. (1906).

slightest probability that the earliest work in Modern European prose fiction was, in its original form, also, the longest in all European fiction, excepting, possibly, one or two of the Spanish and French romances of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹⁶ On the other hand, we know that in the thirteenth century it was customary to add continuations even to historical works and to interpolate them with extraneous matter.¹⁷ Leaving aside additions that have a purely cyclic aim, we have in the history of Chrétien's romances in verse an analogy, still closer home, to what we may reasonably surmise to have been the history of the prose *Lancelot*. The (unfinished) *Lancelot* of that poet was carried on by Godefroi de Leigni, and his *Perceval* (also unfinished) received additions forwards (the so-called *Elucidation*, the Bliocadrans prologue and the Wolfram-Guiot introductory episodes) and continuations¹⁸ (Wauchier de Denain, Manessier and Gerbert, to say nothing of a possible pseudo-Wauchier and the Wolfram-Guiot ending). The

The year 1216 (see my discussion in the ROMANIC REVIEW, III, 185 ff.) is the *terminus ad quem* for the *Estoire del Saint Graal* (at least, in a possible earlier form), which is the latest member of the Vulgate cycle, except the *Merlin* continuation; but by that year Villehardouin's chronicle is the only work of any extent in French prose, outside of the Arthurian romances, and Villehardouin (in N. de Wailly's edition, Paris, 1874, only 150 octavo pages, if we exclude the 59 pages by Henri de Valenciennes) is very much shorter than the shortest member of the Vulgate cycle (*i. e.*, the *Mort Artu*, which in Sommer's edition fills 189 large quarto pages). Gröber, *loc. cit.*, p. 724, remarks that even Latin works of such volume as the romances are in the twelfth century exceptions. Besides, the *Schwerfälligkeit* of the writing of the clerics (the best educated men of the age) as late as the beginning of the thirteenth century makes him skeptical as to romances, composed in the twelfth century. In view of these circumstances, I do not believe for a moment that Sommer is right when he says, p. ix of the Introduction to his edition of the Vulgate cycle, that this cycle "reached the last phase in its development, *i. e.*, the form in which we possess it, at the very latest, by 1215." Compare Villehardouin, with his paltry 150 pages, and the *Lancelot* of our MSS. with its 1195 large quarto pages.

¹⁶ According to my calculation the *Lancelot* contains about two and a half times as many words as Dickens's long novels, *e. g.*, *Pickwick*. The Spanish and French romances referred to are, in the matter of form, lineal descendants of the *Lancelot* of our MSS. Some of them, however, like *Le Grand Cyrus*, appear to outdo their ultimate model in prolixity.

¹⁷ Gröber, *loc. cit.*, p. 724, has already drawn the comparison.

¹⁸ The MSS. of these continuations, moreover, show important and extensive variations. Cf. C. Potvin, *Perceval le Gallois*, III, 47, 84, *et passim*. (Mons, 1866).

closest parallel of all, perhaps, is furnished by the prose *Tristan*, the MSS. of which preserve two versions of that romance, one relatively short and simple, the other (the common version) cyclic in form and longer.¹⁹ The difference in the case of the *Lancelot* is that only the cyclic form has been preserved.²⁰

Our *Lancelot* MSS. themselves, however, afford evidence that even in the non-cyclic parts the romance is probably the result of an evolution, extending through many years. These MSS. show that scribes or redactors or perhaps occasionally other persons did not hesitate: (1) to substitute variant versions of single episodes or even longer stretches of narrative for the versions that were current, or (2) even to add entirely new episodes of their own invention.²¹ In illustration of these different kinds of change, I cite the following instances:

1. The narrative covered by the first 204 pages of Sommer's Vol. IV (Part II of the *Lancelot*)—i. e., from the point where Galehaut takes Lancelot off to Sorelois up to the point where Lancelot (in the *Charete* episode) arrives in the capital of Gorre to fight Meleagant and deliver the Queen—exists, as Sommer (prefatory note to the volume) tells us, "in two distinctly different redactions." As bearing on the subject of the growth of the ro-

¹⁹ On the subject cf. E. Löseth, *Le roman en prose de Tristan* (Paris, 1890), p. xii of the Introduction. Individual MSS. of each group, of course, may show expansions or condensations, compared with other MSS. of the same group.

²⁰ The reason for this, no doubt, is that in the long interval that elapsed between the composition of the *Lancelot* (at the latest, the first decade of the thirteenth century) and the date of our earliest extant MSS., none of which are so early as the middle of the thirteenth century (MS. 342 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, the earliest dated and apparently as early as any extant, was finished in June, 1274), the cyclic form had time to drive out the non-cyclic form entirely, especially as the whole group into which it was fitted had become authoritative. In the case of the prose *Tristan*, the interval between the date of composition (about 1220 or 1230) and date of the earliest extant MSS. (the earliest dated is 1268) is not so great. Besides, it was never so thoroughly welded with a standard cyclic group.

²¹ There is no need to mention the occasional changes in the order of episodes and the abbreviations or expansions within comparatively restricted limits which we find in the MSS. of the *Lancelot*, as of the other members of the cycle. For these expansions in the *Lancelot* MSS. we have a parallel in the Grimaud expansion of the *Estoire del Saint Graal* in certain MSS. It is printed by E. Hucher, *Le Saint Graal*, III, 311 ff. (Le Mans and Paris, 1878).

mance, it is also significant that some MSS.²² offer a combination

²² Cp. Sommer, *loc. cit.*

of both. The redactions²³ differ so much that for these pages Sommer could not introduce everywhere his usual system of reference numbers. He has printed one of them, but, in the present state of our knowledge, no one can say positively whether it is the original version or not.

The texts printed in the Appendices to Sommer's Vol. IV would seem to represent still other variant versions of parts of the narrative, covered by the first 204 pages of that volume.²⁴

See, too, the variant version of III, 404-430, in the British Museum MS., Royal 19, C. XIII, indicated by Sommer in note 5 to III, 404.

2. Gawain's adventures, IV, 182-195, Sommer tells us, are found only in the British Museum MS. Add. 10293, and the adventures of Bohort, Lionel, Hector, and Gawain in the last quest of Lancelot, V, 413-474 (Appendix), only in Harley 6342.

Now, if, despite the influence of a standardized cyclic text, we find liberties of this kind taken with the narrative, we may be sure that still greater liberties were taken with it before such a text was established, and that the original *Lancelot* was expanded and interpolated in the same manner as the other Arthurian romances, mentioned above, quite apart from the question of additions which have a cyclic purpose. Then, undoubtedly, there were considerable additions made with this cyclic purpose in view.

Granting, however, the contention (which in the case of the

²³ In his *Romans de la Table Ronde*, IV, 137, note, Paulin Paris observes that the explanation of Galehaut's dream and the episode of his parliament, together with the election of Baudemagus as governor of Sorelois, are not found in the majority of MSS. These features of the *Lancelot* fall within the 204 pages under consideration.

²⁴ In the Introduction, p. ix, to his edition of the *Vulgate Version*, Sommer spoke of the version of the False Guinevere episode, etc., which he has printed, IV, 365 ff. (in an appendix), as earlier than the common version of that episode. This rarer version is very much shorter and is preserved only in MS. 768 (Bibl. Nat.) and another MS. in the possession of Mr. H. Y. Thompson of London—also, partially, in MS. 339 (Bibl. Nat.). When Sommer came, however, to print this text, he was silent as to his previous claim. Cp. *loc. cit.*, note 1. As a matter of fact, there is no reason to believe that the shortened version was the earlier. In such cases, the chances of priority are always on the side of the longer version.

cyclic episodes, of course, amounts to a certainty) that the original *Lancelot* underwent additions and changes of various kinds, it remains extremely difficult, in the absence of external evidence, to distinguish the limits of such additions and changes; for any one who added to the work of a predecessor (or predecessors) would, as a rule, naturally make his own work fit as closely as possible with that of this predecessor, so that the result might well baffle the highest analytical acumen.²⁵ This is illustrated by the *Charete* story, which has been incorporated into the *Lancelot* romance. It makes no difference whether we assume, as Gröber does (rightly, I believe), that this part of the *Lancelot* was not by the same author as the so-called *Galehaut* section²⁶ that precedes it or not. In any case, the incorporated story, as we know, once constituted a separate romance (Chrétien's *Lancelot*), and is here fitted into a narrative with which it had originally no connection—yet how complete is their union! As G. Paris has said²⁷ of this *Charete* episode, it is "rattaché par mille fils à toute une série d'aventures étrangères." Now, of course, the person who adapted this extraneous story so closely to the *Lancelot* did not have to be identical with the author of the preceding section. If the author of the preceding section (which, for my own part, I do not think so likely) could effect the connection so thoroughly, a continuator could do it just as well. Then, too, within this prose rendering of Chrétien's *Lancelot* we have undoubted interpolations, viz., IV, 174 ff. (*Lancelot* visits the tombs of the elder Galahad and Symeu) and 215 ff. (*Bohort's* cart adventure), both of which are fitted with the greatest exact-

²⁵ In his article "Zur Lancelotsage," *Romanische Studien* (edited by Eduard Boehmer), V, 557 ff. (1880), Paul Märtens (especially pp. 621 ff.) gives a collection of examples of repetition and self-contradiction in the *Lancelot*, but he draws no inference from these materials as to the composite authorship of the romance. Such matters, to be sure, do not always justify the inference of diverse authorship.

What I have said above applies, of course, equally well to composite fiction of modern origin. Take, for example, R. L. Stevenson's *St. Ives*, which he left unfinished at his death and which was completed by A. T. Quiller-Couch. There is a great difference of style between the two parts, but they fit closely together, as far as the story is concerned, and Quiller-Couch's portion shows no inconsistencies.

²⁶ I do not believe with Gröber, however, that it was earlier than the *Galehaut* section. See my discussion below.

²⁷ *Romania*, XII, 387.

ness into Chrétien's story. These instances illustrate, accordingly, the difficulties which we may expect to encounter in delimiting the component parts of the romance which by such successive expansions grew to be the *Lancelot* of our MSS. We can rarely point to some definite line and say: Here one man's work ends and another's begins. Nevertheless, now that we have the *Lancelot* generally accessible in a modern edition,²⁸ Arthurian scholars cannot shirk the task of determining as definitely as is possible the true nature of this romance—which, through its influence on subsequent fiction, both prose and verse, is one of the most important books in European literature—and so, though fully conscious of the thorny nature of the questions involved, I offer the following pages in the hope that they may, in some respects, at least, advance the solution of that very difficult problem—the composition of the Old French prose *Lancelot*.

Inasmuch as there is a general consensus of opinion that the *Lancelot* in its original form had nothing to do with the Grail, it seems best to isolate and discuss, first of all, as far as possible, the passages in our romance which connect it with the Grail romances—especially with the specifically Grail romances of the same cycle (the Vulgate), viz., the *Estoire del Saint Graal* (often called the *Grand St. Graal*) and the *Queste del Saint Graal*. These passages are brief in the first part of the *Lancelot*, but later on—particularly in the last division (= Sommer's Vol. V, and often called the

²⁸ Sommer's edition of the *Lancelot*, as of the rest of the Vulgate cycle, is, of course, not a critical edition. He reproduces (without punctuation) the text of the British Museum MSS. Add. 10292-10294, only substituting the readings of other MSS. where the text of this MS. series is glaringly defective. From time to time he gives also the variant readings of other MSS. at the bottom of the page, but he does not state anywhere how systematic his collations were, so that it is perhaps not always safe to draw inferences from his silence—especially, when one considers the huge bulk of the cycle. The want of critical editions of the prose romances will, no doubt, continue to hamper Arthurian investigation for a long time to come. Pupils of Professor E. Wechssler's began, in 1911, an edition which claimed to be based on all the MSS. Only three rather small sections of it (Hefte 2, 6, 8, of the *Marburger Beiträge zur romanischen Philologie*) have as yet appeared. E. Brugger, *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XL, 37 ff. (1912), has shown, however, that the above-mentioned claim amounts to very little and that the edition offers no real advantage over Sommer's.

Agravain)—they expand to full episodes, and to fix the limits of these episodes will be one of the chief problems that confront us. Furthermore, however, along with such Grail passages, we shall discuss also, for convenience sake, all passages which connect our romance with the *Mort Artu* and other romances that are certainly of later composition than the original *Lancelot*, and which, therefore, furnish, likewise, valuable indications as to the growth of the *Lancelot*—for it is to be remembered that the *Lancelot*, as we have it, apart from any modifications or interpolations that may have been introduced into it to fit it to the *Estoire del Saint Graal* or the *Queste*, and, we may add, the *Mort Artu*, was also subject to interpolation from other romances, such as the *Merlin* continuations or the *Perlesvaus*. Such interpolations may run through all the extant MSS., for the reason that these MSS. all go back to archetypes that are relatively late, as compared with the date of composition of the *Lancelot*, even in its cyclic form, and these archetypes were open to interpolation from romances that had been composed in the interval between the composition of the cyclic romance and the writing down of the archetypes²⁹ of our MSS.

In the following I will first point out the references contained in the individual passages and interpret and discuss them, as far as that seems required. Having considered them *seriatim* from this individual point of view, I shall then turn to the larger questions of composition. I will say here once for all that the passages which I am about to discuss embody in every instance conceptions which (in my judgment) were foreign to the primitive *Lancelot*.³⁰

²⁹ For a fuller discussion of these matters I must refer the reader to my recent article, "Pelles, Pellinor, and Pellean in the Old French Arthurian Romances," *Modern Philology*, XV (1918). See, too, Brugger, *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXX, 176 ff. (1905). Brugger, *ibid.*, XXXIII, 192 (1908), supposes that the *Lancelot* is largely interpolated with material from his hypothetical lost redaction of the *Perlesvaus*, but it could be interpolated from the actual *Perlesvaus* just as well. I may add that there is no reason why even metrical romances, composed in this interval, may not have furnished materials for *Lancelot* interpolations.

³⁰ The fullest list that has been hitherto given of such passages as I am about to discuss is that of Paul Märtens, Eduard Boehmer's *Romanische Studien*, V, 643 ff. (1880).

REFERENCES TO OTHER PROSE ROMANCES IN THE *Lancelot*

III, 3.

At the beginning of the *Lancelot* it is said that in his old age King Ban of Benoit had one child, a son, by his young wife, and that this child (the hero of our romance) "auoit non Lancelos en sournon, mais il auoit non en baptesme Galahos"—the "Galahos" of Sommer's MS., as numerous other passages show, being really a variant for "Galaaz," i. e., Galahad.³¹ Immediately after these words, then, we have the following:

"Et che pourcoi il fu apeleis Lancelos che deuisera bien li contes cha auant. Car li liex ni est ore mie ne la raisons."

The anticipatory reference here is, doubtless, to a passage in the latter part of the *Lancelot*, V, 111:

"Et tout aussi comme li nons de Galaad auoit este perdus en Lancelot par escauffement de luxure, tout aussi fu il recoures par cestui [i. e., Galahad] par abstinence de char."

This idea of the change of Lancelot's name is imitated, no doubt, from the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 74 f., where, on becoming Christians, Seraphe is renamed "Nascien," Evalac, "Mor-drain," and so on. In the present case, however, the process is reversed: Instead of acquiring a new name by baptism, as a sign of regeneration from sin, Lancelot loses his baptismal name, and is given another, as a consequence of his lapse into sin (with Guinevere).

13.

Ban's wife is "deschendue de la haute lignie le roi David."³² Cf., too, III, 88.

This, like everything in the *Lancelot* concerning Lancelot's genealogy, was, no doubt, suggested by the *Estoire*. In that branch, I, 135, it was intimated that Galahad (and hence Lancelot)

³¹ Other MSS. give here the correct form, "Galaaz." So the MS. followed by G. Bräuner in his edition of the beginning of the *Lancelot*, *Marburger Beiträge zur romanischen Philologie*, Heft 2, p. 1 (Marburg, 1911). I shall take the liberty in my quotations of capitalizing proper names, although this is not done either in the MSS. or in Sommer's edition.

³² Bräuner's text (p. 20) has here merely "descendue del haut lignage que vos establites el regne aventureus," etc., but other passages seem to show that the reading of Sommer's MS. is justified.

was descended from Solomon³³—so, of course, from David (though this is not stated). Solomon laid a letter in his marvellous ship, warning his descendant ("Os tu cheualiers boin eureus qui seras fin de mon lignage") to beware of women. This descendant is the knight, "qui puis fist tant de cheualeries el roialme de Logres & mist a fin les auentures que el roialme de la terre foraine & en mainte autre auenoient par lauenture & par la force del Saint Graal si com li contes deuisea cha en arriere." Cf., too, the prophecy, I, 132. We have here, of course, a reference to Galahad, as is plain (if proof were needed) from the sequel to the story of Solomon's ship in the *Queste*, VI, 145 ff.

In connection with the present passage, III, 13, it is desirable, however, to investigate still further the statements in regard to this descent of Lancelot and Galahad from David's line which we find in the *Lancelot*, *Estoire* and *Queste*. Galahad is given this descent, of course, in imitation of Christ, whose putative father, Joseph, was of that line.

Some of the passages³⁴ involved speak only of Galahad's descent from David, and not of Lancelot's, but as far as the *Lancelot* is concerned, Galahad's descent from David must be through his father (Lancelot); for, apart from the analogy of Christ (whose putative father was descended from David) and the clear implications of III, 13, 88, Lancelot is explicitly derived from David in V, 17, 237, whereas only once (III, 117) is such a derivation possibly implied for Galahad's mother (Pelles's daughter). In the passage, III, 117, Pelles is said to be of the lineage of Joseph of Arimathea, who is sometimes confused with Joseph, husband of Mary. This passage (which I presume P. Paris, III, 3, had in mind, when he says that Galahad's mother was descended from Joseph of Arimathea) stands alone in the *Lancelot*, as regards this matter, and its interpolator, doubtless, drew an inference from the *Estoire*, I, 135, which is inconsistent with the rest.

³³ The *Queste*, probably, had no direct responsibility for this descent, for it is to be noted that the mysterious ship is in that branch, outside of the well-known interpolation (VI, 151-161) from the *Estoire*, only once (VI, 177) called Solomon's ship, and that, most likely, is, also, an interpolation. The sword is not called David's sword at all.

³⁴ Besides the passages in the *Estoire*, just cited (I, 132, 135), see, also, the *Queste*, VI, 7.

There is, apparently, a difference of conception, however, in different parts of the *Lancelot* as to whether Lancelot himself was descended from David through his mother or his father. Of course, both lines of descent are possible, but, aside from the absence of any allusion to such a double descent of Lancelot from David, the varying conception of the manner of this descent, recorded in different passages, is, *per se*, more likely to be due to carelessness or confusion—whether on the part of one person or of more.

According to III, 13, 88, as we have seen, Lancelot was descended from David through his mother.³⁵ On the other hand, the question would seem to be left open, V, 17, where it is merely said that he was of the lineage of David and Joseph of Arimathea, and V, 237, where he is referred to as of David's line.³⁶ Similarly, in the *Queste*, VI, 7, Galahad is merely said to be of the lineage of David and Joseph of Arimathea, without any specification as to whether it was in the paternal or the maternal line. The coupling of David and Joseph of Arimathea in these instances, I may remark, is due, in all likelihood, to a confusion of the latter with Joseph, husband of the Virgin Mary,³⁷ the error being of the same general sort as that in the *Estoire*, I, 131, where the Virgin

³⁵ P. Paris, *Romans de la Table Ronde*, III, 14, note (to the passage III, 13), says that the author makes Lancelot's mother a descendant of King David, because he confused Joseph, husband of Mary, with Joseph of Arimathea. The confusion of the two Josephs is, to my mind, certain, but, excepting III, 117, just discussed, there is nothing to show that the author (or authors) of the *Lancelot* thought her descended from Joseph of Arimathea. In fact, apart from these bare statements, that she was of David's line, we are told nothing of her ancestry.

³⁶ The same thing is said of Bohort, V, 416, in the interpolation which is peculiar to MS. Harley 6342 (printed by Sommer as an Appendix to vol. V). Bohort was of identical descent with Lancelot, their fathers being brothers, their mothers sisters.

³⁷ It is possible that the identification of the two Josephs was intentional. The romancers wanted to identify Galahad with Christ, and, at the same time, make him a descendant of the first Grail-keeper.

The *Perlesvaus*, p. 113, even confuses Joseph of Arimathea with Josephus, the historian; for a comparison of the passage with page 1 shows that the Joseph of Potvin's text, p. 113, is identical with Josephus, who is cited at the beginning of the romance as the writer's authority for his story. For other confusions of Joseph of Arimathea and Josephus in mediæval literature cp. Heinzel, pp. 105 f.

is said to be of the line of Solomon (David), whereas it was really her husband, Joseph, who was of that line. (Cf. *St. Matthew*, I.) The real implication, after all, then, of the passages, *Lancelot*, V, 17, and *Queste*, VI, 7, to say nothing of *Lancelot*, V, 237, might be that Lancelot was descended from David in the paternal line. But we may advance a step further; for, granting my assumption that Joseph of Arimathea was, in the above-mentioned instances, confounded with Joseph, husband of the Virgin Mary, a later passage in the *Lancelot*—viz., V, 246—would, beyond question, force us to infer that Lancelot's descent from David was through his father (Ban), inasmuch as in this passage, V, 246, Lancelot's paternal grandfather (so, Ban's father)—here correctly called "Lancelot"—is said explicitly to be of the line of Joseph of Arimathea. The same conception is, no doubt, hidden under a blunder in still another *Lancelot* passage—viz., in the interpolated episode³⁸ of Symeu and the burning tomb, IV, 174 ff.; for, p. 176, Symeu, speaking from the burning tomb, says that Ban (Lancelot's father) originally named his famous son (Lancelot) "Galahad," after his (Ban's) father. Now, in the list of Galahad's ancestors in the male line (back to Nascien) which is given in the *Estoire*, I, 203, Ban's father is not named "Galahad," but "Lancelot." There is an elder Galahad, to be sure, in the *Estoire*, but nothing is said as to his being an ancestor of Lancelot or the younger Galahad. He is the son of Joseph of Arimathea and his conception is related in that romance, I, 209. At I, 283, we learn that he married the daughter of the King of the "Lointaines Illes" and had by her a son named Lienor, from whom Urien and Yvain were directly descended. It would seem, then, that the author of IV, 174 ff., by a very natural confusion of memory, substituted the older Galahad for the older Lancelot in the list of Lancelot's ancestors. Lancelot had himself, according to III, 3, been first called "Galahad," before he lost the name (which, owing to the famous Grail Winner, is in the romances the synonym of purity) through sin, so the author of IV, 174 ff., by a slip of memory, probably, gave his grandfather the hero's baptismal name, instead of the name which was later conferred on him and which, according to the genealogy, *Estoire*, I,

³⁸ The episode is, of course, interpolated under the influence of the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 283 ff., to which it is a sequel.

203, was the true name of his grandfather. The mistake as to the elder Galahad was all the easier to make, because the name naturally belongs in the genealogy of Lancelot and Galahad, the Grail Winner, and not in the genealogy of Yvain. Indeed, when coupled with the fact that according to these genealogies of the *Estoire*, Joseph of Arimathea, the original Grail keeper, had no connection at all with the Grail Winner, but was the ancestor of Yvain, who, of course, in none of the romances has any intimate relation to the Grail, one cannot but suspect that there is something wrong about the *Estoire*, in the form that is alone preserved in our MSS. of the Vulgate cycle,³⁹ and that the genealogies just referred to have suffered blundering alterations.

The natural conclusion from the apparent differences of conception which I have noted in the passages just discussed is that the brief interpolations, III, 13, 88, as to Lancelot's descent from David through his mother are by a different hand from that which penned the longer interpolation, IV, 174 ff.⁴⁰

As regards the *Estoire* (*Grand St. Graal*), it may well be, as

³⁹ The passage relating to these matters are essentially the same in Furnivall's and Hucher's texts as in Sommer's. See F. J. Furnivall, *History of the Holy Grail*, II, 100, 117, 347 (London, 1864), and Hucher, *Le Saint Graal*, III, 117, 126, 275 (Le Mans and Paris, 1878). R. Heinzel's speculations in regard to the different Galahads, *Über die französischen Gralromane*, pp. 134 f. (Vienna, 1892), are not supported by any evidence whatever. Nothing is more certain in respect to the Arthurian romances than that Galahad, the Grail Winner, is a purely literary creation, and the elder Galahad is, of course, simply a later double (after a fashion) of the Grail Winner. It does not seem to have been observed that the most distinctive thesis of E. Wechssler's book, *Die Sage vom Gral* (Halle, 1898), viz., that Galahad (not Perceval) was the original Grail Winner, is derived from this passage in Heinzel's treatise. This thesis is manifestly untenable and has found no further acceptance at all among students of these subjects.

⁴⁰ The *Estoire del Saint Graal* does not represent that Lancelot was descended from David through his father. If we take the genealogy of Galahad in the *Estoire*, I, 203, and test it at every stage we find no support for this view. Ban (Lancelot's father) was the eighth in descent from Nascien, who heads the list. Of Nascien's parentage we are told nothing, and the same is true of his wife Flegentine. Their son, Celidoine, married (I, 195) a daughter of Label, King of Persia (cf. I, 141). She was christened Sarracinte, after Mordrain's wife. As to the descendants of Nascien between Celidoine and Ban, nothing is said about their wives. But, as stated above, the genealogies in the *Estoire* may have been altered.

Heinzel (p. 141 of his Grail treatise) maintains, that the author of this branch really thought of Galahad as descended from David through his mother. The authors of the Grail romances, I believe, equated her with the Virgin Mary, and the *Estoire*, I, 131, as we have seen, like the *Legenda Aurea* (cited by Heinzel), made Mary (wrongly) a descendant of David. In that case, Galahad's descent from David would be through the Fisher Kings (types of the Holy Spirit). Heinzel's reconstruction of Galahad's genealogy, however, as he thinks the author of the *Estoire* conceived it, has no support whatever in the texts and is wholly unnecessary. If this was, indeed, the conception of that author, there is no evidence at all that he had thought the genealogy out in detail—hence the obscurity which left the door open to the divergent interpretations of the *Lancelot* interpolators. One may remark finally that there is not the slightest probability in Heinzel's suggestion that the elder Galahad ever existed outside of the *Estoire* and passages written under its influence.

19-21.

The account of Merlin's birth and love affair with Nymenche (Ninienne and other variants) has nothing to do with the Grail. It is in all probability, however, an early interpolation, as has been shown by Brugger.⁴¹

⁴¹ *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Lit.*, XXX, 188, and the argument that precedes this conclusion. The author of the interpolation probably took Robert de Borron's *Merlin* as his starting point. Sommer, p. xxi of the Introduction to his *The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, I, appears to have forgotten Brugger's article when he makes no distinction between the author of this interpolation and "the writer of the *Lancelot*."—In this same passage, pp. xx f., Sommer collects a number of incidents (all but one relating to Uterpandragon) which he supposes "the writer of the *Lancelot*" to have derived from an hypothetical lost *Brut*. It is preposterous, however, to lump together the first two examples, III, 3 (Uterpandragon aids Aramons against Claudas) and III, 46 (Nascien and Hervi de Rivel were companions of the Round Table in Uterpandragon's reign) with V, 130 (an old knight, turned hermit, who had known Urien in Uterpandragon's reign, refused to join the Round Table, because he hated a member of it), V, 117 (Ban and his brother, Bohort, do homage to Arthur after Uterpandragon's death), and V, 144 (on returning from Arthur's court shortly after the king's marriage to Guinevere, the elder Bohort had been attacked in ambush by Ceres del Uermeil Castiel), for they are separated by nearly 900 large quarto pages and are in parts of the *Lancelot* that are certainly by different authors. For the rest, there is no reason to look for these inci-

28-29.

"Et sacies que onques a son tans el roialme de logres nen ot vne que saparellast a l(u)i [i. e., Guinevere] de grant biaute fors que .ij. seulement, si fu lune du chastel qui siet en la marche de Norgales & des Frans, si a non li chastiax Gazeuilte. Et la dame ot non Heliene Sans Peir. Et chis contes en parlera en auant. Et lautre fu fille au Roi Mahaignie. Che fu li rois Pelles qui fu peires a Amite meire Galaat chelui qui vit apertement les grans meruelles del graal. Et acompli le siege perillous de la Table Reonde. Et mena a fin les auentures del roialme perelleus & auentureus. Che fu li roialmes de Logres. Cele fu sa suer si fu de si grant biaute que nus des contes ne dist que a son tans fust ne se peust de biaute a lui apparellier. Et si auoit non Amite en sornon & en son droit non Helizabel."

This passage is, no doubt, a late interpolation. That it is interpolated is proved by the Grail allusions—also by its exaltation of Helaine Sans Per, who figures in only one brief episode of the *Lancelot*, III, 390-394, and has no importance in the romance. The author of the *Lancelot* would not have had in mind so early in his work this insignificant character. Moreover, nowhere else in the six volumes (2,335 large quarto pages) of Sommer's edition of the Vulgate cycle, to say nothing of the supplementary seventh volume (323 more pages), containing the *Livre d'Artus* of MS. 337, is Galahad's mother given a name of any kind. In his Index and side-lines Sommer misleads the inattentive reader by calling her "Elaine (Helaine)." It was doubtless with Malory in mind that he introduced this error into his edition, for she is so called in the *Morte Darthur*.⁴² Now, if the memory of a modern editor

dents in a lost source. They are all manifestly inventions for the nonce.—With regard to III, 46, P. Paris, III, 53, is, I believe, right in regarding this passage as being of different authorship from its setting, although he is mistaken in identifying Kaheus de Cahors of his MS. with Keu, the seneschal, and imagining that the passage is older than its setting. It is, no doubt, really later. It is an error of Sommer's to cite Nascien in this passage. Nascien is not mentioned anywhere in the *Lancelot*, as Sommer's own Index shows.

⁴² How she came to be so called I have explained in *Modern Philology*, XV (1918). Malory, no doubt, found the name already in his French original. P. Paris, V, 309, also applies it to Galahad's mother, but if he had MS. authority for this, we do not know what it was.

can play him such a trick,⁴³ we need not be surprised if something of a kindred nature should have befallen a medieval interpolator in regard to the same character—if, indeed, as is still more likely, he did not arbitrarily invent a name for her.

The source of the present interpolation is to me clear. It is the eulogy of Guinevere in the Vulgate *Merlin*, II, 159. The MS., however, followed by Sommer in his edition is so corrupt in the latter part of the passage as to be unintelligible, so that for all but the first words (ending with *Gazewilte*) I shall have to substitute the (correct) reading of MS. 747, as reproduced by him in *Modern Philology*, V, 305 (1908). The passage runs thus:

"Et li contes dist quele [i. e., Guinevere] fu la plus sage feme de la bloie Bertaigne & la plus bele & la miex amee qui onques fust el pais ne en la terre, fors seulement Elain Sans Per la feme Persides le rous del castel de Gazewilte & la fille le roi Pelles de Listenois del chastel de Corbenyc qui fu niece le riche roi pescheor & le roi malade de plaies dont li uns ert apelez Alains des Illes en Listenois, & cil ert malades de maladies de plaies & li riches rois qui estoit apelez mehaigniez estoit naurez parmi les .ii. cuisses de la lance uengeresse & fu apelez par son droit non quant il estoit en sante li rois Pellinor de Listenois. & li rois Alains & li rois Pelinor si furent frere germain & cele pucele dont ie uos di si estoit lor niece & fille le roi Pelles qui frere (estoit) a ces .ii. dont ie uos ai dit. icele pucelle fu la plus bele que len ueist onques an la terre & la plus nete. icele garda le santisme graal iusquiel ior que Galaad fu engendrez."

The connection between these two passages which exalt Guinevere above all women, save Helaine (Elaine) Sans Per and Galahad's mother, is too obvious to require argument, and that the former is based on the latter seems to me equally obvious; but the *Lancelot* interpolator must have quoted from memory, for what he has written, from any point of view, is a tissue of blunders. In the first place, it contains the absurdity of making Amite (Helizabel) both Galahad's mother and his sister. Then, it identifies Pelles with the Maimed King, which is not paralleled elsewhere in the

⁴³ Through a similar slip of memory, in the headlines and notes to my edition of the *Mort Artu* (Halle, 1910) I called the Maid of Ascalot, "Elaine," although she really does not bear that name (in the extant texts, at least) before Malory. I observed the error in time, however, to call attention to it in my Introduction, p. xxxv, note.

Vulgate cycle, save in a similar blundering passage in some MSS. of the *Queste*, VI, 150. In *Modern Philology*, V, 293 ff., however, Sommer has pointed out that, unlike the MS. on which his edition is based, the majority of the *Lancelot* MSS. (15, to say nothing of the early prints, against 8⁴⁴) have in this place "Perceval"⁴⁵ instead of "Galahad," the MS. variants being Pelesvaus, Perleuauus, Perlesuax, Perleuax, Perceval, Parceveau. But granting that "Perceval" stood originally in the passage and is not due merely to the effort of the later scribes to correct a crass blunder in the interpolation, this fact would not have the importance which Sommer attaches to it, for the form of the name shows that the writer must have had the *Perlesvaus* in mind, and, consequently, was merely guilty of a momentary carelessness or confusion of memory which is nothing like so bad as the blunder found in this passage in virtually all MSS., viz., that of making the mother of the Grail Winner at the same time his sister. For, with the exception of one or two MSS. which try to remove this absurdity by putting "mother" for

⁴⁴ Sommer, *loc. cit.*, neglects to include the British Museum MS., Add. 10293, in his enumeration of the MSS. that have "Galahad"; also Royal, MS. 19. C. XIII.

⁴⁵ In the ROMANIC REVIEW, IV, 462-471 (1913) I have examined in detail all the evidence as to "Perceval" here having been brought into such MSS. from the *Perlesvaus*, viz., in my argument against the common theory that Perceval once occupied in the Vulgate cycle the place held by Galahad in our extant MSS., so that I shall not go over the ground again now. In writing p. 469 of the article I overlooked Sommer's exact statement in *Modern Philology*, V, 293, as to which MSS. offer the reading "Galahad," and which "Perceval," but this does not affect my conclusions. If my argument in the article, just cited, is sound, there is no need to enter the jungle of hypothetical lost cycles with Sommer, pp. 295 f., and *Romania*, XXXVI, 546, in order to explain the passages under discussion. See, too, my article, mentioned above, in *Modern Philology*, XV (1918). Sommer, p. 295, ascribes "the greatest possible critical value" to the fact that in the British Museum MS., Royal 19. C. XIII, in the passage we are now discussing, after "la fille le roi Pelles" there once stood "le roi Mahaigne lo oncle Parceveau," but afterwards "Parceveau" was stricken out and "Galaad" substituted. But it is absurd to attach any importance to a scribal blunder, which was later corrected. Brugger, though himself believing in a Perceval-Lancelot cycle, has already (*Zs. f. frs. Spr. u. Litt.*, XL, 47, note 11) disposed of Sommer's errors of statement and reasoning here. Moreover, the term of "oncle Galaad" betrays, I have no doubt, the influence of *Queste*, VI, 8. For a similar influence of the *Perlesvaus*, p. 222, on this MS. in a matter of detail (the scar on the brow of the Maid of Ascalot), see my *Mort Artu*, p. 280, and ROMANIC REVIEW, III, 182, note 16.

"sister," the MSS. are all alike in this respect, whether they read "Galahad" or "Perceval."

It will be observed that Galahad's mother, according to our interpolation, was called "Amite en sornon & en son droit non Helizabel." The words "en son droit non" betray likewise the influence of the above quoted passage from the Vulgate *Merlin*, II, 159, where the Maimed King "fu apelez par son droit non quant il estoit en sante li rois Pellinor de Listenois." This idea of people having double names is only found in the *Estoire del Saint Graal* and works (like the Vulgate *Merlin*) or passages (like III, 3) written under its influence. In the *Estoire* compare Seraphe-Nascien, Evalac-Mordrain, Orcans-Lamer, etc. The change of name in the *Estoire* accompanied the formal adoption of Christianity and so corresponded to a frequent actual custom. Then, in Lancelot's case (III, 3), it became merely symbolical of a change in spiritual status (lapse into carnal sin)—so, too, in that of Galahad's mother (in imitation of Lancelot) in the present passage; for her change of name is, also, conceived of, no doubt, as a consequence of her loss of virginity. Before that loss she bore a name with sacred associations, "Elizabeth" (mother of John the Baptist and cousin of the Virgin Mary), "Helizabel" and similar variants being, doubtless, corruptions of "Elizabet" ("Elizabeth"),⁴⁶ which is the reading of some MSS. After losing her virginity, like Lancelot under similar circumstances, she acquired a *sornon*, "Amite." But *c* and *t* were constantly confused in mediaeval MSS., and "Amite" is plainly a variant of "Amice," name of the friend of the heroine (Lidoine) of *Meraugis de Portlesgues*.⁴⁷ Now, barring the present passage and a passage in the Portuguese *Demanda*,⁴⁸ which

⁴⁶ Sommer, *Modern Philology*, V, 293, note, gives the MS. variants of Helizabel and Amite, respectively, without specifying in which or in how many MSS. each occurs. These variants are: Amide, Anite, Aude, Amides, Enite, and Eliabel, Elizabel, Heliabel, Helizabel, Elizabeth, Elizabet. "Aude" is, no doubt, due to the influence of the name of Roland's lady-love in the *Chanson de Roland*, "Enite" to that of the heroine of Chrétien's *Erec*. In Robert de Borron's *Joseph*, II, 2309 f., Joseph's brother-in-law was called, it is said, "Hebron," "par son droit non", II, 3344 f., "le riche Pescheur"; but this is not a parallel case.

⁴⁷ Cf. especially II, 3749 ff., 5090 ff. in M. Friedwagner's edition (Halle, 1897).

⁴⁸ Cf. Sommer, *Romania*, XXXVI, 545 f. Again, Sommer here connects the name with the theory of a Perceval-Lancelot cycle, which I have tried to show is untenable.—"Amice" is, probably, a pseudo-learned feminine to "Amis,"

evidently derives it from our *Lancelot* interpolation, this name occurs nowhere else in mediaeval romance, save in the *Meraugis*. I have, therefore, no doubt, for my own part, that the interpolator got it from that source. The name is of frequent occurrence in the *Meraugis*, since it is borne by a character who plays a considerable part in the romance, whereas in the *Lancelot* it occurs only in this single passage.⁴⁰ If, as Heinzel (p. 158, note 6, of his *Grail treatise*) suggested, the name of Bohort's son, Helains li Blans, was derived from or influenced by ("H)elins li Blans" in *Li Biaus Descouneus*, l. 527 (G. P. Williams's edition, Oxford, 1915), why could not an interpolator draw upon the *Meraugis*, when he wanted a name for Galahad's mother? The Helis (Helins, Helains) li Blans (Blois) of the *Lancelot* (for variants and passages, cf. Sommer's Index), I may add, was certainly taken from *Li Biaus Descouneus*—so, too, probably the names Gales li Gais (for li Chaus) and Thors li fiex Ares, associated with it directly, III, 178, although these last two occur also in Chrétien.

88.

On this page, l. 2 (Et se)—l. 12 (guide), we have a passage concerning the descent of Lionel and Bohort—Lancelot's double first cousins and hence of exactly the same ancestry as himself—with an allusion to the future achievement of the Grail adventures by Galahad. Of Lionel and Bohort it is said:

"Car combien quil soient haut de par le peire riens namonte enuers le hauteche quil ont de lor boine mere. Car nous sauons par le tesmoignage des escriptures que ele & si anchisor sont deschendu del haut lignage au haut roi Dauid—ne nous ne sauons a com grant chose il poront monter. Car che sauons nous bien que en la Grant Bartaigne atendent tout a estre delivre des merueille(s) & des auentures qui i aiuenent par un qui sera del lignage la meire a ches enfans."

and is meant to suggest friendship or friendliness. Cf. "Amiles" in "*Amis and Amiles*."

⁴⁰ The *Meraugis* and the *Lancelot* have certain episodes in common, and it is possible that the latter is in these matters the source of the former, but one cannot say definitely. See Brugger, *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXVIII, 59, XXXI, 246, and M. Friedwagner, pp. clxvi ff. of the Introduction to his edition of the *Vengeance Raguidel* (Halle, 1909). We are dealing here, however, with an interpolation which is certainly much later than the *Lancelot*, taken as a whole.

This passage, of course, could not have stood in the original *Lancelot*. It raises the same questions as the passage p. 13, and I will, therefore, refer the reader for a consideration of these questions to my discussion above.

107-108.

This passage, extending from p. 107, l. 34 (*Li contes*) to p. 108, l. 22 (*nostre ioie*), contains no allusion to the *Queste*, etc., but is suspect on account of its religious tone, which is foreign to the *Lancelot*, in general. In commenting on the five great festivals of the year when Arthur was accustomed to hold high court, the writer expounds quite in the manner of a mediaeval theologian the difference between Easter and Whitsuntide in their import to the Christian. I believe that we may safely set this passage down as an interpolation.

112-117.

The description of the ideal of knighthood, pp. 112-116, which the Damsel (Lady) of the Lake sets before Lancelot for his emulation reads like an intercalation, but there is not sufficient religious emphasis in this description, *per se*, to connect it indisputably with the Grail conceptions. Nevertheless, its connection with the passage that follows immediately after—p. 116, l. 36, to p. 117, l. 12—is so close that it is better, perhaps, to accept the whole as an intercalation. This latter passage, which mentions Joseph of Arimathea, the elder Galahad, etc., of course, is a later addition to the primitive *Lancelot*.

After naming certain characters in Jewish history as examples of perfect knighthood, the Damsel (Lady) of the Lake adds to the list Joseph of Arimathea and his son, "*Galahas li haus rois de Hosseliche qui puis fu apelee Gales en lonor de lui*" (*i. e.*, the older Galahad), *Pelles de Listenois*, and *Helains li Gros*, brother to *Pelles*.

Most of this comes straight from the *Estoire del Saint Graal*. *Hosseliche*⁵⁰ (*Hocelice*, *Haucelice*, etc.), as the supposed name of

⁵⁰ As appears from Sommer's Index, this name assumes an extraordinary variety of forms in the MSS. We find it even as "*Ostrich*"! All the variants are, doubtless, corruptions, and it is impossible to say what the true form is. *Galice* (= *Galicia*) may, perhaps, enter into the composition, owing to the assonance with *Gales*. Could it then be a corruption of *Haute Galice*? Another possibility is that we have here a corruption of some noun, meaning

Wales before it was renamed Gales, originated with the author of this branch and is only found in it—and that but a single time, I, 282—and in the romances (Vulgate *Merlin*, II, 174, *Livre d'Artus*, VII, 140—once each) or passages (*Lancelot*, III, 117, IV, 27—in Sommer's edition, disguised as "lices"—175) written under its influence. Helains li Gros is derived, also, from the *Estoire*, I, 203. Only there have we the name in just this form. It is given to an ancestor of Galahad, who is the third in descent from Celidoine, being a son of the second Nascien. The epithet, "li gros," belonged, originally, to Bron's son, Alain,⁵¹ who in the *Estoire*, I, 251, is expressly distinguished from Celidoine's descendant (Helain).

But the influence of the Vulgate *Merlin*, II, 125, 159, is also discernible in the present passage in the idea that Pelles had a brother named Alain. Nowhere else, save in the *Livre d'Artus* of MS. 337, VII, 145, *et passim*, and the present passage, do we find this idea,⁵² and the *Livre d'Artus* in question is generally recognized as dependent on the Vulgate *Merlin*.⁵³ It is very likely that the qualification, "de Listenois," attached to Pelles's name, is, also, a mark of the influence of this last-named romance. This, too, seems char-

"country" (e. g., *pais*) + *galesce* (*galesche*), the adjective to *Gales* (Wales). In the metrical romance, *Sone de Nausay* (ed. by M. Goldschmidt, Tübingen, 1899: Bibliothek des Litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart, CCXVI), which belongs to the late thirteenth century, the name of the Grail Castle is *Galoche*, 5503, *Galoches*, 16801, 17897, etc., *Galoces*, 16849. These are all, no doubt, corruptions of *Galesce(s)*, *Galesche(s)*. Probably its source had *Castiaus Galesches*.

⁵¹ See G. Weidner's *Der Prosaroman von Joseph von Aramathia*, p. 127 (Oppeln, 1881), where it is said: "Li dozesme de ses [i. e., Bron's] fiz ot non Alains li gros." This romance is, of course, the prose rendering of Robert de Borron's *Joseph*. The epithet, however, is wanting in the verse form.

⁵² In his Index Sommer cites the *Queste*, VI, 102, under the heading of Alain, Pelles's brother, but the passage gives no support to this identification. In fact, the correct reading there is not "Alain," but "Herlan"—the name of another character. I have discussed this and all other matters pertaining to this Alain, Pelles's brother, in *Modern Philology*, XV (1918).

⁵³ P. Paris, *Romans de la Table Ronde*, II, 397, and IV, 239, note, and 365, expressed doubts as to whether the *Livre d'Artus* of MS. 337 was not earlier than the *Lancelot* and Vulgate *Merlin*. In his brochure, *The Structure of Le Livre d'Artus and its Function in the Evolution of the Prose Romances* (London, 1914), Sommer has developed these suggestions, which had found no acceptance among Arthurian scholars, but has not convinced anybody, as far as I am aware. I have commented on his argument in *Modern Philology*, XV (1918).

acteristic of the Vulgate *Merlin* and *Livre d'Artus* of MS. 337. We find it, besides, at the beginning of the *Queste*, VI, 3, 5, but the chances are that it did not belong to the *Queste* in its original form.⁵⁴

Finally, a glaring proof of interpolation in this passage is the fact that it refers to Pelles as dead, although his whole share in the story comes later in the romance. The words are:

"Si en fu li rois Pelles de Listenois qui encore estoit de chelui lignage [*i. e.*, the line of Joseph of Arimathea] li plus haus quant il viuoit."

140.

Lancelot stops at a house of religion (thirty miles from Nohaut) where there was a tomb of Leucan, "nies" (according to other MS. variants, son, or merely of the same lineage) of Joseph of Arimathea. Joseph's lineage bore the Grail and conquered the mis-believers. "Nies," it should be remarked, could mean either nephew or grandson in Old French.

This seems merely an isolated interpolation—probably by the same person that interpolated the passage, III, 112 ff., which we have just considered. The interest in Joseph's line appears to show this. The character, L(e)ucan, is derived from the *Estoire*, I, 42, 75, where he is one of three Grail-bearers that accompany Joseph of Arimathea. At I, 42, however, he is called Joseph's "cousin germain." Neither the authors nor the interpolators of the Grail romances troubled themselves about exactness in such matters. The name is probably a corruption of "Leucius" in the pseudo-Gospel of Nicodemus.

Lancelot's fight with Alibon at the Queen's Ford, pp. 140 ff., which follows immediately upon his visit to the house of religion, is manifestly, also, an intercalation, and, probably, from the same hand as that episode. The incident which is here narrated to explain the origin of the name, "Queen's Ford," is found only in the *Livre d'Artus* of MS. 337, VII, 122, and that is, no doubt, our inter-

⁵⁴ I have commented on this in the article just cited. Since writing that article I observed that Heinzel in his Grail treatise, p. 160, suggests that the idea of Pelles's having a brother, Alain, and the idea of making Pelles a king of Listenois belonged originally to the *Merlin* continuations, and were later introduced into the *Lancelot*. The Vulgate *Merlin* is really responsible for both.

polator's source.⁵⁵ The Saxon wars, in which the incident occurs, belong properly to the *Livre d'Artus* (Merlin continuation) division of the cycle, and not to the *Lancelot*, so that there can be no question that the *Lancelot* is the borrower in this instance.

199-200, 215-223.

The first of these passages recounts Arthur's strange allegorical dreams concerning his sins, the second the interpretation of these dreams by a holy man.

We have in these passages only one Grail allusion, p. 222, viz., to the manner (related in the *Estoire*, I, 20 f.) in which Joseph of Arimathea was miraculously sustained in his wanderings, after he left the Holy Land. Nevertheless, the religious tone of the whole excites suspicion. It is, in part, an imitation, no doubt, of the popular prophecies of Merlin, but the interpolation, on the religious (or pseudo-religious) side, was inspired, I believe, by the *Estoire del Saint Graal*.

As late as p. 226 we have an allusion to the interpreter of the dreams.

226.

Gawain exhorts the knights of Arthur's court to enter upon the quest for Lancelot, "la plus haute queste qui onques fust apres celi del Graal"—an obvious interpolation. These words were sure to be inserted after the *Lancelot* was united with the Grail romances.

381.

Sagremor is said here to have received his epithet, "li desrees," from Guinevere on the day that the thirty knights defeated the Saxons and Irish before "Estreberes." Sommer (Index) identifies this place⁵⁶—rightly, no doubt—with the "Vandeberes" of the *Merlin* continuations—similarly, Brandague, King of the Saxons, with Brannague, and Margan, King of Ireland, with Maaglans (also peculiar to those continuations).

There is no account of Sagremor's killing these kings in the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation (or *Livre d'Artus*), but we do find

⁵⁵ P. Paris, III, 151, note 2, has already observed this.

⁵⁶ Possibly the Old French name for Shrewsbury may be responsible for "Estreberes." The name is found as "Estroburges" in the *Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal*, line 691 (edited by Paul Meyer, 3 vols., Paris, 1891-1901).

such an account in the *Livre d'Artus* of MS. 337, VII, 45. Here it is related that Sagremor killed the two brothers, Magaat and Brannague, at Vandebere. The *Lancelot* interpolator, then, is alluding to this passage. He has, however, got one detail wrong. It was the old queen of Vandebere, not Guinevere, who in the *Livre d'Artus* of 337, VII, 46, conferred on Sagremor his epithet.⁸⁷ Our interpolator, nevertheless, clearly has in mind VII, 44-46. What I said above at the end of my discussion of the previous borrowing (pp. 141 f.) from this *Livre d'Artus* applies here, too.⁸⁸

Brugger in the Heinrich Morf *Festschrift* (Halle a. S., 1905, p. 71, note 1) assumes that the *Livre d'Artus* of 337 is dependent on this *Lancelot* passage, and not *vice versa*, as I have done, but that assumption is untenable, for in the latter we have a mere allusion (and plainly, to VII, 44 ff.), in the former a full narrative.

429.

In the penultimate paragraph of what Sommer calls Part I of the *Lancelot*, it is related that clerks wrote down the preceding adventures of Arthur's knights. The paragraph ends: "Et tout cil autre [i. e., narratives concerning the adventures of the other knights] furent branche de cestui [i. e., narrative of Lancelot's adventures]. Et li contes Lancelot fu branche del Graal si com il y fu aioustes."

The last sentence states plainly that the *Lancelot* was adjusted to the Grail romances. It was, of course, written by an "adjuster," as, indeed, was, most likely, the whole paragraph.

IV, 19-35.

The whole passage concerning Galehaut's dreams (p. 5) and their interpretation by Helyes of Toulouse, pp. 19-35, is very likely an interpolation. There is no question at all, however, about the words, p. 23, ll. 19 f.:

⁸⁷ Keu (Kay), on the other hand, nicknamed him (p. 46) "li Morz Ieuns." We find earlier in the *Lancelot*, III, 278, a different explanation of Sagremor's epithet, "li Desrees," which, in its turn, is imitated in the *Livre d'Artus* of 337, VII, 55. P. Paris, III, 290, note, observed the connection of the present passage with the *Livre d'Artus* of 337.

⁸⁸ It may be that the reference in the *Queste*, VI, 52, to the slaying of Perceval's brothers is a late insertion, based on the *Livre d'Artus* (VII, 239), like these passages in the *Lancelot*; but a lost metrical romance is more likely the common source of both.

"Et autresi que nulle beste ne puet durer contre le lupart fors li lyons. tout aussi ne puet estre mielldres cheualiers de lui [*i. e.*, Lancelot], fors uns tos seus, mais il en sera mis & sera fils a cel lupart."

The leopard in the allegory is Lancelot, and the son of the leopard is, of course, Galahad. After the *Lancelot* was adjusted to the Grail romances, the exception in favor of Galahad as the best knight had to be inserted always.

The Grail allusions run all through pp. 26-28 and stamp these pages as an interpolation. We find here an explanation as to why the lion (Galahad) is superior to the leopard (Lancelot). The allusions to the knight who will end the adventures of the Grail refer, of course, to the *Queste*, and in that branch, VI, 94, 98 (in the episode of Lancelot's vision) Galahad figures also as a lion. In the *Estoire*, I, 203, he is again (in Nascien's vision) allegorized as a lion—uncrowned, it is added.⁵⁹

It is a sign that the entire dialogue, pp. 19-34, between Galehaut and Helyes is an interpolation, when we find Galehaut, p. 26, talking about the Grail. Down to the present passage none of the Grail allusions have appeared in the speeches of characters.

In the prophetic eulogy of Galahad by Helyes, pp. 26 f., we have the following words:

"si nos dist Merlins qui encor ne nos a menti de rien que de la chambre al roi mehangnie de la gaste forest auenturosse en la fin del roialme de lices [for "*Hocelices*," doubtless] uendra la merueilleuse beste qui sera esgardee a merueilles es plains de la Grant Bertaigne. Cele beste sera de diuerse maniere sor toutes autres bestes. Elle aura teste de lyon et cors dolyfant et autres membres et si aura cuer dacier dur et serre qui nauera garde de flescir ne damolier."

This passage is connected with the interpolation, III, 28 f., by the apparent identification of the Maimed King with Pelles, which is exceptional in the Grail romances, being probably due to an error,⁶⁰ and with the interpolation, III, 112 ff., by the introduction

⁵⁹ One might, at first, suspect the influence of this detail at p. 22 (higher up in this same supposed interpolation), where Galehaut, as an uncrowned dragon, confronts the crowned dragon, Arthur; but, as a matter of fact, Galehaut is not called king in the *Lancelot*, but merely "prince" and "sire" (= lord).

⁶⁰ I have discussed the matter in *Modern Philology*, XV (1918). The real

of Hocelices (from the *Estoire*), which is, also, rarely mentioned in these romances. It would seem, then, that all three of these passages were the work of the same interpolator.

It is to be observed still further that the description of Galahad in the last sentence of the passage just quoted is, barring a few changes in the words and their order, identical with the description of Perceval in the *Perlesvaus*.⁶¹ The latter runs as follows:

"Il a chief d'or, et regart de lion, et nombril de virge pucele, et cuer d'acier, et cors d'olifant, et tesches sans vileinnie."

Which text is the borrower?—It can hardly be open to question that the *Lancelot*, in its original form, is earlier than the *Perlesvaus*, but we are dealing here with an interpolation. Now, there is other evidence, as we have just seen, to connect the present passage with the interpolation, III, 28 f., where, as I have already remarked,⁶² the form of Perceval's name (found in the majority of the MSS., instead of Galahad's) points unmistakably to *Perlesvaus* influence. I believe, then, that in the present passage our interpolator is the borrower.

We have, p. 33, another clear imitation of the *Queste*. In the former (IV, 33) Helyes is disclosing to Galehaut in the chapel the total number of years the latter is to live. He does so by drawing a corresponding number of lines (45) on the wall with charcoal. A mysterious hand, as red as a coal of fire, holding a blood-red sword, appears through the closed door and strikes out 41 and a quarter of the lines that indicated years. The apparition of the hand is thus described:

"si regarde Galehot et voit uenir parmi lui vne main et si estoit li huis fermes. & vns (*sic*) bras tant comme il dure dusques as Maimed King lived in the same Palais Auentureus (in the forest here named) as Pelles, himself, so that the identification with Pelles in the present passage is not absolutely required from the strictly logical point of view, but Pelles was the lord of the castle and father of Galahad's mother; there is every likelihood, therefore, that the allusion here is to him.

⁶¹ Cf. Potvin's edition, *Perceval le Gallois*, I, 37—also, 197 f., with a slight change in the word-order. In the *Livre d'Artus* of MS. 337, VII, 52, we have the same description applied to an unnamed knight, who is, however, doubtless, Perceval; for the allusion to Keu's relations to Arthur's son, Lohot, makes it clear that the writer is drawing on the *Perlesvaus*.

⁶² See p. 258, above.

espaules et fu uestus d'une lee mance dynde de samit trainant dusques a la terre. Et duroit dusques au coute. Et dilueques en auant estoit vestus dusques al poing ausi comme de blanche soie. Li bras estoit lons a merueilles et la mains estoit rouge comme charbons enbrases. Et cele main tenoit vne espee de sanc vermelle & lenheudure de lespee dusques au poing. Et sen vint tout droi a maistre Helye," etc.

Compare this with the following description in the *Queste*, VI, 108, of a similar apparition in the adventure of Gawain and Hector at the dilapidated chapel:

"En ce quil parolent ensi, si voient issir parmi luis vne main de la chapele qui apparoit iusques vers la coute si estoit couerte de vermeil samit delie. A cele main pendoit .j. frein de cheual ne mie moult riches & tenoit en son poing vn gros chierge qui moult ardoit cler si passa par deuant aus & entra el cancel & sesuanui dentrels en tel maniere quil ne sorent quele estoit deuenue."

There are differences in the descriptions, of course, owing to the different requirements of the situations, but the passage in the *Queste* plainly furnished the inspiration to the *Lancelot* interpolator.⁶³

I repeat that this whole conception of Galehaut's premonitory dreams was a later insertion, for, after all Helyes's elaborate interpretation, when Galehaut dies, IV, 155, not a word is said of them.

J. DOUGLAS BRUCE

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE.

⁶³ Before leaving this interpolation, it is, perhaps, hardly necessary for me to say that the various pretended predictions of Merlin in it, pp. 23, 27, 28, are inspired by the prophecies of Merlin that were current in the literature of the period and have nothing to do with the Old French *Merlin* romances. It looks as if we had a reference to some one of these romances IV, 40, where it is related that wars between Uterpandragon and Urien explained (ultimately) the presence of so many exiles in Gorre. But there is no such story in the *Merlin* romances. Indeed, Urien only enters the narrative of that branch after Uterpandragon's death, and the passage in the *Lancelot* is an invention of the author of this part of the romance. The same thing applies to the statement, IV, 124, that Morgan learned from Merlin what she knew concerning enchantment. Through Geoffrey, Wace and Robert de Borron Merlin's magical powers were known far and wide.

P. Paris, IV, 138, note, states that the interpretation of Galahad's dreams is not found in most MSS. This would, of course, confirm the theory of interpolation. Sommer says nothing on the subject.

(To be continued.)

STUDIES IN THE TEXT OF THE SICILIAN POETS

THE RELATIVE TRUSTWORTHINESS OF THE CHIEF SOURCES

IN a previous paper in the *ROMANIC REVIEW*¹ I summarily indicated the problems which the text of the Sicilian poets brings up, and made certain statements about the manuscript evidence. It is my design, in the present paper, to substantiate those statements by a detailed examination of certain canzoni contained in all three of our primary sources, P, V, and L. There are eleven such canzoni out of those attributable to the Sicilian group, occupying consecutive positions (tho sometimes with intervening non-Sicilian pieces) in L, the order of which, for convenience, is here followed, with reference to the position of each poem in P and V, and to the best printed text.

- I. L 55: *Madonna, dir vi voglio*.—P 37, V 1.—Langley, *Giacomo*, p. 3.
- II. L 56: *Ben m'è venuta prima cordolienza*.—P 19, V 7.—*Ibid.*, p. 13.
- III. L 58: *Meravilliosamente*.—P 39, V 2.—*Ibid.*, p. 6.
- IV. L 60: *Già lungamente, amore*.—P 28, V 111.—*Ibid.*, p. 40.
- V. L 61: *Vostr' orgogliosa cera*.—P 62, V 35.—Monaci, p. 63.
- VI. L 62: *Amore avendo interamente voglia*.—P 12, V 78.—No good text.
- VII. L 63: *Membrando ciò k'amore*.—P 38, V 179.—Langley, p. 37.
- VIII. L 64: *Amor mi fa sovente*.—P 15, V 84.—Monaci, p. 202.
- IX. L 65: *S'eo trovasse pietanza*.—P 58, V 107.—Casini, *Poeti Bolognesi*, p. 133.
- X. L 72: *Biasmomi dell'amore*.—P 64, V 110.—Monaci, p. 78.
- XI. L 73: *Contra lo meo volere*.—P 74, V 36.—Monaci, p. 66.

In the ensuing discussion, reference is made to each poem by the Roman numeral in this table. Questions of disputed attribution are for the present disregarded.

Most editors of the Sicilian poems have regarded V as the most reliable source. It was the first of the three to be published, and it contains by far the largest number of poems; yet it by no means offers substantially better texts than its rivals. None the less, L's variants have often been relegated to the background, and P has been regarded with explicit distrust. The origin of this feeling

¹ *A Plea for the Sicilian Poets*, vol. VI, No. 4 (pp. 448-457).

lies in the words of Caix,² who calls the MS. the work of a copyist "more tender of elegance of execution and richness of ornament than of scrupulous exactness of reading. . . . While the poems of this poet [Guittone] and of the southerners are beyond measure corrupt and deformed, those of Bonagiunta are transcribed with particular care and with much correctness." This is gravely overstated; for in truth the "carefully transcribed" poems of Bonagiunta exhibit precisely the same slips which we shall find in the Sicilian pieces, and the alleged distinction becomes wholly illusory. "Yet," Caix continues, "certain important features of the earliest poetic language are in this MS. and in this alone, marvellously preserved, so that it remains, in certain respects, the most faithful to the first literary tradition." This is unquestionably true; but if it is the case with forms, why may it not equally be the case with readings? Thus the opinion of Caix is not so sweepingly adverse as it at first sight appears; but the unduly unfavorable words have been meekly accepted by later scholars, as by Parducci³ and Langley,⁴ with consequent relegation of P to a distinctly inferior position. It is this estimate which we shall chiefly have reason to revise in the light of the ensuing discussion.

It is perfectly true that the text of P shows numerous signs of carelessness; the question is, just what is the nature of this carelessness? Does it seriously invalidate the entire text, or does it merely affect a word or a passage here and there? It may be said at once that some of the errors are the result of hurried running together of syllables, as a letter-writer might put *rember* for *remember*, and do not at all indicate fundamental corruption; thus, in I. 8 we have *tenese l'aita* for *teneselo a vita* (L), in VI. 21 *divendo* for *dive-nendo*. Other errors arise from non-observance of rime, as, in III. 34, *cognosco* for *angoscio*, in VI. 21 *alegresa* for *allegranza*, and the like. This fault, however, occurs likewise in V; in VI. 29 we have *saccante* for *sacciate*, in X. 9 *scordo* (repeated from 8) for *stordo*. On this score, then, V's alleged superiority to P does not appear. Obviously, to settle the dispute, we must examine a sufficient number of variants to show how often V or P is seriously

² *Le Origini della Lingua Poetica Italiana* (Florence, 1880), pp. 17-18.

³ *I Rimatori Lucchesi del Secolo XIII* (Bergamo, 1905), p. lxxxvi.

⁴ *The Poetry of Giacomo da Lentino* (Cambridge, 1915), p. xxxvi.

corrupt, and how often either offers a reading intrinsically superior to that of the other. We shall also, by including the variants of L, secure both a useful checking device and the means of attaining an exacter idea of the value of L's text. Naturally the conclusions thus reached will not necessarily be true of other parts of the MSS.; but since a beginning must be made somewhere, and since the Sicilian poems must have in part a different transmission from that of Tuscan work, we shall gain at least a basis for further study, and a clearer notion of the state of the text in the Sicilian poems themselves.

Before beginning the detailed examination, it will be convenient to indicate certain general sources of variation, yielding differences too minute to be here discussed. Divergences of spelling, where the same word or form is obviously intended, are disregarded;⁵ so are minute syntactical variants, such as the employment of different conjunctions (cf. XI. 23: *però* P, *perciò* V, *dunqua* L) or prepositions (cf. VII. 6: *dal* V, *del* PL); the substitution of a reflexive for a non-reflexive verb form (cf. V. 43: *ispegna* V, *si spegna* PL); the presence or absence of a pronoun (cf. I. 29, where V omits *eo*); or a shift of word-order without substitution (cf. I. 52: *ke gecta a la fortuna* P, *c'a la fortuna gitta* VL). Any conclusions on such small points must obviously depend on our view of more extensive dissimilarities; and to deal with them here would unwarrantably extend our discussion without any real profit. Moreover, by confining our attention to major variants we shall avoid as far as may be the errors incident to working from diplomatic transcripts, not from the MSS. themselves.

I

It so happens that this poem is one of the strongest witnesses for the value of P. Tho in fourteen cases P varies from VL, the only obvious corruptions are in lines 37-40, of which no MS. gives a wholly satisfactory version. A few of these cases are slight; two others (3, *vostro* P, *grande* VL, and 22, *constrecto* P, *distretto* VL) are neutral, but with no objection to be raised to P's reading. In 6, P's *in tante pene è miso* seems to me smoother than V's *ch'è'n*

⁵ Individual readings are given in the orthography of the respective MS., but in some cases a normalized text is used in incidental discussion.

tanta pena miso, or *L's che'n tanta pena è miso*; so, too, perhaps, in 52, quoted above. More important and equally defensible readings are given by P in the second half of stanza i, its version of which is this:

- 9 Or donqua moro eo?
No, ma lo core meo
More spesso e più forte
Che non faria di morte—naturale;
13 Per voi, donna, cui ama,
Più ke sè stesso brama,
E voi pur lo sdegnate;
Donqua nostra amistate—vide male.

Here, in 9, V's *adunque morire'eo* is less smooth; L's *dunque mor'u'viv'eo* has rather the look of a conscious emendation. In 11, L's *assai più spesso e forte* for PV's *more spesso e più forte* involves the loss of a verb form needed for smoothness; and in 16 L's *vidi* for *vide* may be an emendation, or a mere failure to note that the verb in the third person is governed, like those above, by *core*. I likewise prefer P's reading in 16 to the *amor vostr'amistate* of VL. Thus, by accepting P, we secure a clear and smooth-running text.

We should likewise, I believe, follow P in the beginning of stanza ii, where its version differs radically from that of VL. Lines 17–20 run thus in P:

Del mio innamoramento
Alcuna cosa ò decto;
Ma sì com'eo lo sento
Cor nolo penseria nè direa lingua.

whereas VL read

Lo meo innamoramento
Nom pò parire in detto;
Così com'eo (ma sì come L) lo sento
Cor nolo (core nol L) penseria nè diria lingua.

It seems to me that P's reading best accords with the train of thought. Giacomo *has* just said something of his love, for he has spoken of the pain it brings him; but he is not able to express it in its full intensity, as he goes on to say:

Ciò k'eo dico è neente
Inver k'eo son constrecto.

This is assuredly intelligible, and less conventionally rhetorical than the version of VL. For these reasons, I have no hesitation in preferring P.

If we now inspect the readings peculiar to V as against PL, we shall find few of them preferable (except perhaps *invenire* for *avenire* in 34), and several unquestionably corrupt. In 7, V's *vede che si more* is out of harmony with the context. In 45 V's è is inferior to PL's *fa*; in 51 V's *così* for è *sì* makes havoc of the passage by removing a necessary verb. If we add these to the already cited lines in which V differs from P without advantage, we shall scarcely gain a renewed faith in the plenary inspiration of the former.

Of six cases in which L differs from PV, two (11 and 16) have been mentioned above. In 26, PV's *perkè no mi consuma* seems better than L's *e mai non me consuma*. The other cases are of minor importance: *madonna* for *bella* in 56, *bella* for *donna* in 66, *facesse motto* for *dicesse motto* in 76. Here, as in most of the poems we are to examine, L oftener stands with either P or V than in opposition to both of them. In two cases where all three differ, L gives a smoother reading in 8 (*teneselo a vita*) and in 24 (*foc'aio al cor non credo mai si stingua*, where *al cor* is lacking in PV).

We have now left for consideration some cases in which all three MSS. differ. Of these I mention some merely to illustrate a frequent but not important type of minor variation, in which the essential meaning is unaffected, and which, in subsequent poems, I shall largely disregard. Thus, in 31 P reads *e non sacio k'eo dica*, V *e non saccio che dica*, L *e non so che mi dica*; in 53, P reads *e scanpane per gieto*, V *e camppane per getto*, L *e canpan per lo getto*; in 73, P reads *ben vorria k'avenisse*, V *a deo c'or avenisse*, L *vorria c'or avenisse*. In such cases no reading possesses intrinsic advantages over the others. In 36-40, however, we have a graver problem. P, as was noted above, reads erroneously in 37 *e paremi uno spirito*, where V correctly has *sì com'omo in prodito*, and L *chà sì com'om prudito*. I take it that P's *spirito* is an alteration of the unusual *prodito* (for *prurito*; see Langley's note *ad loc.*) which

the scribe did not understand. So in 38 VL's *lo cor* is right, P's *k'al cor* wrong; and in 39 P's *e giamai non son kito* is less good than VL's *che* for *e* and *è* for *son*, if we desire to keep *core* as the subject thruout. In 40, however, all three radically diverge, thus:

- V fintanto che non vene al suo sentore
L mentre non pò toccar il suo sentore
P s'eo non posso trar lo suo sentore

Using the text of VL for the opening of the passage, what is the sense of the whole? "My heart makes me feel like a man with the itch, for it is never quiet"—until it is scratched, is the obvious supplement. Which reading, then, best fits? Evidently P's is least good; V's is understandable, but L's seems more forceful. *Sentore*, by the way, means here, as elsewhere, *sensation* or *feeling*.

We may thus conclude that P offers us, despite some slight errors, several acceptable readings, except in 37-40; that L has some independent readings which deserve consideration; and that V offers quite as many real corruptions as P, and of a more serious nature, without the compensation of better individual readings.

II

The text of this poem presents few striking divergences, and relatively few cases in which one MS. stands against the other two. Of two such cases in which P stands alone, I think its readings preferable: 1, *cordollienza* (parallel to *cordollio*, -ioso) for *al cor doglienza*, and 9, *quella gente* for *l'altra gente*. L reads in 5 *tant'è potente* for *ma sì è potente*; in 30, *per soffrir* for *per mio amor*; in 31, *torna in pietanza* for *torna pietanza*, the latter being more idiomatic in the period (like our English idiom *turn salt*). Similarly V has, in 15, *bella* for *donna*; in 17, *ch'io non faccio*, less smooth than *eo non vi faccio*; in 36, *fugge* for *teme*. Obviously from variations like these very little can be inferred. More significant are four cases of considerable divergence. The first is 26:

- P di piacer penza—assai, poikè si pente
L di far plagensa—pensa, e poi si pente
V di ben fare penza—e poi si pente

where either P or L is obviously preferable to V. So in 29:

- P seria sovente—più ricca la gioia mia.
 L dunque più gente—serea la gioi' mia.
 V dunque saria più gente—far la gioia mia.

V's reading flatly disregards the metre. Yet again, in 33:

- P ma se voi sete senza percepenza
 L e voi che siete senza percepenza
 V voi so che siete senza percepenza

P is obviously best. It would hardly be tactful to preface a plea to one's lady by assuring her of one's confidence in her lack of perception. In these three cases, then, the reading of V is unacceptable; in one that of P is preferable, in the others surely possible; in all three it is clear that P and L embody different traditions. Less simple is the fourth case, 40:

- P ki sofra vince e sconpra one acordanza
 L ki sofra conpie e vince ogni tardanza.
 V se sofera sgombra e vince ogni tardanza.

Here PL agree on the first two words, all disagree on the third, and L agrees with V for the rest of the line. A case of this kind is hard to settle by any but the rule-of-thumb method of building a composite line by taking all readings attested by any two of the MSS. against the third. Langley has actually done so in this case, and the principle, if carried out consistently, might prove helpful in disposing at least of the smaller variations.

In this poem, then, we find P and L distinctly superior to V in three cases of serious disagreement, with P entitled to credit in certain passages, and nowhere seriously corrupt. In view of the general close agreement of the MSS. I think it significant that V's peculiar readings should so uniformly be inferior or worse.

III

Here again we encounter, I think, a case in which P is clearly superior to its rivals. It has at least ten individual readings, only one of which (43) is obviously corrupt, and that merely in anticipating the rime-word of the next line; four, tho minor, are defensible; and the remainder are of capital importance. In 2-6 the vulgate, based on VL, is as follows:

Un amor mi dstringe
 E sovenmi ad ogn'ora
 Com'omo che ten mente
 In altra parte, e pinge
 La simile pintura.

In 3, P reads *mi tene*, in 4 *om ke pone mente*, in 5 *in altro exemplo*, all of which seem to me preferable, and the last the only way of making sense of the passage. In 25, P's *come quello ke crede* is smoother than VL's *sì com'on che si crede*, and in 27 its *ancor non vegia inante* gives a much better sense than VL's *ancor no a (or va) davante*. V has two peculiar readings: *voi siete* for *parete* in 11, *così* for *al cor* in 28; in both cases Monaci and Langley prefer to follow PL. In 20 and 23, L exchanges the rime-words without discoverable reason; in 45 it reads *forte* for *bella*, the latter being preferable, and in 47 *molte* for *tut'e*.

When we turn to three cases of divergence in all three MSS., we again find P most acceptable. In 13 it reads *o deo co'mi par forte*, better than L's *e molto mi par*, or V's *anzi m'asembra morte*, which can scarcely be right, and is rejected by Monaci and Langley. In 37 V's *se voi siete* (emended by Langley to *se siete* for the metre) seems to me not clear; the same is to be said of L's *se colpo*; whereas P's *s'eo guardo* is clear and simple. (This passage is further discussed below, because of its bearing on the correct order of stanzas.) In 32, P's insertion of *in* seems to give quite as good a sense as V's omission of it; L goes off on a wholly different tack, with *tanto prende più loco*. In two of the three cases, then, L represents a different tradition; in one of them V is in error, in another less clear; in all three, the readings of P are legitimately entitled to acceptance.

Finally, as to the order of stanzas.⁶ It is clear that v and vi in V should be interchanged, as they are in PL, followed by Monaci and Langley. But what is v in L is iv in P; hence the simplest correction of V is P's shift of V's vi to fourth place, followed by V's iv and v, whereas L compared with V has the order iv, vi, v. To demonstrate what I think is the correct order, let me summarize

⁶ For convenience I have used above the older line-order to be found in the printed texts.

the trend of the thought. In iii, Giacomo tells us how he painted a picture of his lady, on which he gazes when he cannot see her. In VL's iv the fire of this love is described, in their v the result of an actual meeting. Now it seems to me that if, with P, we follow iii with the description of the actual meeting, we get an effective contrast of situations, on which follows the general account of the ardency of his love. Moreover, P's individual readings fit well into this order. "If I look as I pass," its version of iv begins, "I do not turn toward you, fair one, to look again (*risguardare* taken in its literal sense, not as a mere synonym of *sguardare*); as I go, I heave a great sigh." Likewise, at the end of v, the converse of the situation is given: "In like manner I burn when I pass by and do not look." That is, whether the poet, on meeting his lady, looks at her but once, or whether he passes by without looking, the effect on him is the same. I believe that anyone who carefully reads thru the three parallel versions in Monaci will be convinced that P is in almost every case better, and I therefore unhesitatingly maintain that P's order of stanzas and individual readings should be made the basis of any sound text. We have seen that editors have adopted P's readings when they are incontestably better; the question is simply, why should not these readings be equally accepted where the merit, tho real, is less marked? In other words, if P, as here, is unquestionably right in several important cases, why not assume that it is right in the others? This is not to assert that such a course should be everywhere followed; but I do believe that the definitely superior version of any MS. in a given poem should lead us to accept its readings wherever we can do so.

IV

We have here a case of uncertain attribution, V assigning the poem to Tiberto Galliziani of Pisa, L to Rugieri d'Amici, and P, less plausibly, to Giacomo. The variants offered by the different MSS. are numerous, but for the most part too minute to merit discussion here. P's text is distinctly unsatisfactory, being corrupt in 3 (*dalcòr* for *d'altro*), 17 (anticipating end of the following line for the correct *e vorria dire*), 25 (*non è strania gente* for *nolle sterea gente*), and 26 (syncopation of syllables). In other cases

(as 19, 27, 30) P is either mildly corrupt or less preferable; only in 45 can its reading, *ella arà'l pentimento*, be argued for against VL's *ell'à lo perdimento*. V and L are for the most part close, tho in 42 V's *voglio di molte* is an error for *vorrei* (or *vorria* P) *di morte*. On the whole L offers the most acceptable text; whether this implies an equal credibility for its attribution is a question to be considered later.

V

This poem, generally attributed to Arrigo Testa, presents several variations among the three MSS., but none of very great importance. It is to be noted, however, that V has a number of errors: 16, *li vezi* for *levezza*; 34, *mondo* for *modo*; 41, *vedendo per* for *vedete pur*; 42, *infin che* for *ke fin ke*. In 62, V has what should be 63, and in place of the real 63 repeats 51. Moreover, few of V's non-corrupt variants seem at all preferable. P, on the other hand, is definitely corrupt only thrice: 10, *mi* for *vi*; 45, *è miso* (V's *in uso* is probably right); and 64, *fermeza* for *fermanza* (the correct rime). L's reading in 7 is presumably incorrect, as involving repetition of a previously occurring rime; in 40 it reads *verso l'amore* for *ver la natura*. We may sum up the matter by saying that V not only differs more often from the other two, but has far more corruptions;⁷ and that L almost always coincides with either P or V, having very few peculiar readings.

VI

This poem, attributed by VL to Mazzeo di Rico, by P to Raineri da Palermo, is not accessible in a good critical text. P is slightly corrupt in 21 (*divendo* for *divenendo*) and 26 (*alegreza* for *alegranza*); and more seriously so in 20, where part of the line is lost. V, however, has two cases of false rime to set against P: *fallenza* for *fallanza* in 16, *saccante* for *sacciate* in 29. Moreover, lines 47-48 are given in exact reversal of the sense of PL, for no assignable reason. The latter MSS. read

ke la pena ke l'omo à indegnamente
assai più dole dolorosamente,

⁷ In line 15 of Monaci's text of V, *Pafan* is a misprint for *l'afare*, also the reading of P and L.

whereas V has

ke la pena che l'omo à dirittamente
duole assai meno.

L reads in 41 *pur so ch'eo n'aggio adolorato il core* instead of *eo so ch'eo n'agio doloroso core*, and supplies two words needed for the metre: *bene* in 51, and *gran* in 54. Neutral variants are as follows: 6, *vostra* P, *nostra* VL; 34, *servisio* P, *bon fatto* VL; 39, *veramente* P, *duramente* VL; 13, *compimento* V, *piacimento* PL; 45, *molto* V, *di ciò* PL; 29, *ma voglo che sacciate* L, *a ciò ke voi sacciate* PV. These indicate a fair degree of independence in the three MSS., a fact confirmed by several passages in which all three diverge. Thus, in 26-27 P has

come quello ke piange e alegreza
ke lassa, ancor li sia dispiacimento;

L,

sicome quei ke piange d'alegranza

and the next line as in P; V,

come quelli che piange l'alegranza
e lascio, ancor mi sia dispiacimento,

where the shift to the first person seems unwarranted. Likewise in 32 we have this variation:

P partendo me vi lasso ad uno amante
L da voi partendo lassovi a un amante
V partomi da voi e lasciovi ad uno amante,

in which V seems distinctly inferior. The closing lines of the poem are disturbed, and no MS. gives a wholly satisfactory version of them.

On the whole, this poem is chiefly important as showing us that V is not exempt from the type of faulty or careless rime usually charged against P, and that all three MSS. are capable of wide divergence in a single case.

VII

Yet another case of disputed attribution, V giving the poem to Beroardi, L to Giacomo, and P to Piero delle Vigne. If V's attribution is right, the poem would pass from the Sicilian circle to the

early Florentine; but until its provenance has been more minutely studied, it is convenient to discuss it here. In the text all three MSS. diverge, and both P and V show incidental corruptions. P has *pianto* for *pensamento* in 5, *dolcemente* for *tanto dolce* in 30, and *k'ancor* for *a torto* in 16—the first two surely wrong, the last probably so. P also omits lines 19–24, tho a space was left for them. On the other hand, P's *dismarrimento* in 3 is better than *del marrimento* of VL; and in 34 P's insertion of *è* helps the sense. V, in turn, has four corrupt spots: 11, *di merzede* for *di me merzè*; 18, *ello* for *lo*; 54, *soferenza* for *caunoscenza*; and 55, *challei* for *ke*. L, for its part, has no obvious corruptions, but a number of alternative readings, as 17, *ver me che m'à conquizo* for *in ver me poi m'à priso*; 26, *sospiri* for *dollie*; 32, *che tene per tal via* for *perde e va per tale* (*altra P*) *via*; 40, *bella* for *spera*; and 59, *prima* for *ansi*. Finally, in 43–44 V's version is supported against PL by its agreement with the rime-scheme. Hence we may say that the poem yields two results: (1) the middle place of L, partly agreeing with one or the other MS., partly offering alternatives of its own, but nowhere corrupt; and (2), the prevalence of incidental errors in V no less than in P.

VIII

This poem exhibits a striking harmony between P and V, and an equally marked difference from them on the part of L. P has against VL only *penare* for *pensare* in 26; V has against PL only *consolamento* in 24, and that was corrected to PL's *confortamento*. There are very slight divergences of all three MSS. in 12 and 30, and a marked one in 36, thus:

P ch'io la terrò per donna in vita mia
 L ma tuttor la terrò per donna mia
 V ch'io la voglio tuttora per donna mia.

Otherwise, P and V are identical, except for the normal variation in spelling. L, on the other hand, has at least five considerable variants, and some minor ones; moreover, it adds two stanzas to the three of PV. The variants are legitimate, not corruptions, as the following list will show:

17 L	<i>venire</i>	PV	<i>eo viver</i>
20	<i>lo su'bel chiaro vizo</i>		<i>in tale guisa conquiso</i>
23	<i>ch'eo ne son conquizo</i>		<i>di veder lo bel viso</i>
24	<i>che'l mi terrea</i>		<i>e tegnomi</i>
25	<i>conforto e non ò</i>		<i>confortomi e non agio</i>

Hence we have here a novel relation for our series: a case in which P and V stand near together, in which L shows a wholly different tradition, and in which all three MSS. are notably free from corruption.

IX

This poem yields little that is instructive. P has two obvious corruptions: 9, *e dicio oi lasso* for *che dico oimè lasso*, and 14, *sol* for *so che*; and two neutral variants: 28, *laund'eo sento perir* for *und'eo sento morir*, and 11, *a gioi'non s'avenè* for *nè gaugio*⁸ (*nullo ivene* L, *nol s'avenè* V). V has *faccio* for *faria* in 5, *laove* for *a cui* in 22, *molto* for *k'assai* in 37, L has *mersede la chierrea* for *merzè le kereria* in 3; *se'l pregar* for *ke* (or *ch'al* V) *pregar* in 7; *mossa* for *mostra* in 18. There is divergence of all three twice: 24,

P *ke gioi'mi sì n'acresca* (or *s'inacresca*?)

V *che gioia me n'acresca*

L *che gioi'ressuna cresca,*

where L has taken its own tack; and 34,

P *sì come'l mare e l'onda*

V *come nel mare l'onda*

L *se non come'n mar l'onda* (reading after correction)

where P is obviously less good. The other variants are too slight to affect the sense, or to provide us useful material. It is to be noted that V adds two stanzas to the three offered by PL.

X

This poem is attributed by V to Galliziani, by P to Rinaldo d'Aquino, whose name also heads it, apparently as a Latin dative, in L. L's text differs markedly in a number of cases, as 6, *disvianza*⁹ for

⁸ This form from Provençal *gaug* in both mss. is noteworthy.

⁹ I have not found this word elsewhere in the Sicilians; it would thus be preferred as *lectio difficilior*.

disianza; 15, *ma tutto m'è neente* for *ma tucto ciò m'è neente*; 34, *sta* for *par*; 38, *fera* for *altera*; 46, *ben* for *e*; 54, *lo mal* for *l'amor*; 81, *ancora* for *ed anco a*. P is twice corrupt: 9, *tucto* for *tanto*, and 49, *como non voglo* for *c'amor non vol*; in three other cases (18, *dice come dolente* for *e dice oimè dolente*; 47, *pur* for *più*; 72, *caunoscenza* for *convenenza*) I see no reason to prefer P. V, in 20, inserts a needless *fare*, and in 64 reads wrongly *a l'amore del blasmante* for *l'amore ne blasmate*; in 43 its *v'amo* for *amo* is less good, since the poet is speaking in general, not addressing himself to his lady. In 51 all three diverge widely:

L e quella und' i' arraggio
 P a quella k'eo dovragio
 V a ella per cui moragio.

Hence L's text is seemingly to be preferred, while V and P are practically on a par in the matter of incidental corruptions, since V has a false rime in 9.

XI

This poem, which may perhaps not belong to the true Sicilian group, is not at all points perspicuous. P omits the sixth stanza, and puts what is the fifth in VL before their third; it also offers several minor corruptions: 9, *e'l giorno nona nocte ladu pari* for *n'è giorno non anotta laove apare*; 18, *si prende* for *si riprende*; 29, *convelli* for *convenelo*; 38, *la fa* for *li fora*; 50, *avermi* for *ver me*; and 65, *ne* for *non è*. Certainly the scribe must at best have copied in some haste; but three cases in which all three MSS. diverge suggest either that the original was hard to decipher or that some other factor disturbed the transmission. They are 37:

P ke razione dolzore
 L serà gioi' e dolzore
 V farà gioi' e dolzore,

where V and L are closer as against P; 51,

P e assai mi richiamo
 L e acciò mi richiame a
 V en suo amore chiamo,

where P and L are closer as against V; and 55:

P si mostran benvoglente nasce e vene
L si mostra benvoglente nasce bene
V si mostra benvoglente nasciene,

where we might conjecture that V had set down what could be deciphered of a mutilated or illegible text, whereas P and L had essayed emendation. Without closer scrutiny of the text, however, I should say only that it offers a difficult problem; that no MS. is decisively superior to the others; and that P is least good of the three.

CONCLUSION

Little more than a glance at the results reached in our study of individual cases is needed to show how diversified are the conditions. P is notably good in I, II, and III, but bad in IV and XI. L is notably good in IV and X, and never so erratic as its two companions; but it sometimes agrees for the most part with one or the other, as in VII, sometimes diverges widely, as in VIII. But V nowhere offers us a text conspicuously good, is distinctly poor in I, II, and V, and surely is at least as disfigured by errors as is P. In view of the actual evidence of readings, how can we support a blanket endorsement of V as "generally excellent"?

As a matter of fact, the palm for mechanical correctness must be unreservedly awarded to L. Once the reader has become accustomed to its peculiar word-divisions and to its Pisan orthography, it is the easiest of the three to read in a diplomatic transcript. Moreover, it is especially scrupulous in matters of metre, not always carefully watched in P, and frankly neglected in V, which revels in redundant syllables and often in grossly hypermetric lines. We must ask, however, whether this perfection of detail may not be due to conscious editing on the part of the scribe. For instance, are the insertions of words that complete the metre in cases like I. 24 or VI. 51 and 54 the result of accurate following of the source, or of intentional addition? Are the occasional shifts of word-order mere caprice, or did they seem to the copyist to give a better reading? May not even some of the variants be the product of a desire to improve the text? By these questions I mean to suggest the possibility of intelligent editing, not to raise an accusation of tampering with the text; for I believe that the scribe of L

was more nearly a cultured literary student (perhaps himself a Pisan poet?) than were either of his rivals. Where L offers a distinctly superior text of a given poem, we ought of course to accept it; but its general position with respect to the other sources deserves more attention than it has yet received.

It is, I think, undeniable that each MS. rests on more than one source. I cannot believe that all P's variations are due to scribal caprice; nor, on such a view, can I understand how P and V should be so close in VIII, and in other cases so far apart. Again, is it not significant that the three poems in which P is at its best are all by Giacomo, and may therefore have come from a single good source? P is indeed erratic, but not to such a degree that we should expect all its faults or all its virtues to centre in a given spot. Indeed, the characteristics of a scribe, both good and bad, tend to be apparent thruout his work (a fact which helps to justify such detailed studies of separate portions as the present); and a marked increase of either class is most readily explained on the supposition that a very good or a very bad source emphasized them in a given case.

So I come back to the previous statement that the text of every poem is a problem in itself, to be settled only after scrutiny of all the MS. evidence. A text of XI which relied solely on P would indeed be defective; but a text of I or III which ignores P cannot be called satisfactory. No MS. can lay claim to plenary inspiration; each must be judged for what it offers, and neither be prized too highly nor unduly depreciated. If the present discussion has sometimes assumed an air of special pleading for P, it is merely because previous students have so often unduly slighted it; and I have endeavored to record its shortcomings no less than its merits. No single mode of procedure will solve all the problems which the text of the Sicilians offers; but if we can substitute, for sweeping acceptance or dismissal of any particular source of information, a clear idea of the relative value of all, we shall at least have the basis for a consistent handling of those problems. In subsequent papers I hope to extend this treatment to various points which still appear more or less dark.

CHARLES E. WHITMORE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

TEDBALT OF THE *CHANCUN DE GUILLELME* AND
HUGH III, COUNT OF THE MAINE (992-1015). A
POSSIBLE HISTORICAL PARALLEL

THE figure of "Tedbalt le cuart cunte," as it appears in the first part of the *Chançon de Guillelme*, is one of the most vivid and life-like in Old French epic literature. But, despite the attention given to this noble poem since its discovery in 1903, no one, so far as I know, has as yet indicated an analogous character either in history or saga. So that the following parallel may not be without interest to students of epic origins.

All readers of the poem will recall the consistency and vigor with which the character of Tybalt is drawn, as well as the evident scorn that the poet displays for him throughout. In order, however, to indicate the sequence of events in the episode, I shall give a brief résumé of the first 405 lines of the *chanson*.

Deramed the Saracen has laid waste the coasts of France. News of his landing and his ravages is brought to Bourges, where Tybalt is count. With him are his nephew Esturmi, and also Vivien, nephew of the brave count William of Barcelona. Tybalt and Esturmi, who are both drunk "*que plus ne poeit estre*," reject with scorn Vivien's suggestion that his uncle William be summoned to aid. The next day they march away against the Saracens with ten thousand men of arms. They come to the Archamp by the sea and discover the pagan host, innumerable. Instantly Tybalt is seized with panic fear. He suggests that all flee, a proposal rejected with scorn by Vivien. Then Esturmi and Tybalt tear off the ensigns of their lances, that they may not be recognized, trample them under foot in the mire, and ride away, accompanied by all the cowards. Vivien is left in the Archamp, with the valiant men. Tybalt, in his flight, rides unwittingly into a gallows, and his fear is so increased thereat that he gives physical evidence of it. Then Girard, another nephew of William, by a trick, gets possession of Tybalt's arms and war-horse. And the episode ends as follows:¹

¹ I quote from the edition of Suchier: Halle, 1911.

- 386 Girarz s'adubet des armes el chemin,
le runcin lasset, el bon cheval s'asist.
Tiedbalz se drecet si cum hom esturdiz,
devant lui guardet, si choisist le runcin,
390 prent s'a l'estrieu e es arçuns s'asist.
Quant fut muntez, membrez fut del fuir;
devant sei guardet, si vit un grant paliz:
forz fut a reille, qu'il ne pout pel tolr,
e tant fut halz, qu'il nel pout tressaillir.
395 Desuz al val n'osat Tiedbalz guenchir
pur Sarazins, dunt at oï les criz.
Desus el tertre vit un fulc de brebiz,
par mi la herde li'n avint a fuir.
En sun estrieu se fiert uns moltuns gris.
400 En sun estrieu se fiert uns gris moltuns.
Tant le traïnet e les valz e les munz:
quant Tiedbalz vint a Beürges al punt,
n'out a l'estrieu que le chief del moltun.
Unc mais tel preïe ne portat gentilz hom!

The essential features of this episode are the folly and cowardice of Tybalt, his flight and disgraceful return to his home town. That "coward counts" existed at all times during the feudal régime is no doubt true, and it is entirely possible that the poet was drawing from life. But it seems to me that in the figure of Hugh III, count of the Maine,² we find a real parallel to the Tybalt of the poet. The disgraceful episode in which he figured is related by William of Jumièges, in his account of the reign of Richard II,³ duke of Normandy (996-1026). The story of Hugh's cowardice is told very succinctly, but in order that the historical setting may be fully understood, I shall quote the whole chapter:

Temporibus namque sub eisdem Odo, Carnotensis comes,⁴ quandam ducis Ricardi sororem, nomine Mathildem, cum multimodis muneribus a fraterna domo accipiens, sibi in matrimonio legitime copulavit. Cui dux medietatem Dorcassini⁵ castri dedit dotis

² See Latouche: *Histoire du comté du Maine pendant le X^e et le XI^e siècles*, Paris, 1910, pp. 18-19.

³ *Gesta Normannorum ducum*, ed. Jean Marx, Paris and Rouen, 1914, pp. 83-85.

⁴ Eudes, count of Blois and Chartres, 1004-1037.

⁵ Dreux (Eure-et-Loir).

nomine, cum terra super Arvae fluvium adjacente. Nonnullis hinc elabentibus annis, haec eadem Mathildis, Dei disponente judicio, moritur: absque liberis. Post cujus obitum duci terram pretitulatam repetenti comes Odo nimiis versutiis cepit contraire, nolens illi quietam dimittere Dorcassini castris tuitionem. Quapropter dux, ascitis Britonibus cum Normannorum legionibus, super Arvae fluvium hostiliter veniens, castrum condidit quod Tegulense⁶ vocavit. Sumptis ex Odonis comitatu alimoniis, eandem munitionem abundantissime replevit, Nigellum⁷ Constantiniensem atque Rodulfum⁸ Totiniensem necnon Rogerium filium ejusdem cum eorum militibus custodes in ea relinquens. Quibus patrat, prospere recessit inde, unumquemque jubens ad sua redire. Odo vero comes, convocatis clam ad sui suffragium comitibus Hugone⁹ scilicet Cinomannensi ac Waleranno¹⁰ Mellendensi cum eorum militum copiis, tota nocte equitans, ad Tegulense castrum venit, preeuntibus signiferis. Quos ut viderunt proceres pretitulati, custodibus intra municipium dimissis, repentino impetu foras cum suis erumpentes, commiserunt prelium cum eis. Quos illico Deo juvante, partes ducis ita prostraverunt, ut multis peremptis, plurimis vulneratis, reliqui, per devia turpiter fugientes, opaca nutabundi silvarum quererent latibula. Odo vero atque Walerannus, querente suffragium vitae, Dorcassini castris se occuluerunt munitione. Hugo nempe, cui insederat equo extincto, pede fugiens, ad caulas ovium divertit, lorica, qua indutus erat, sub sulco tegens telluris. Dehinc clamide opilonis se amiciens, septaque gregum infatigabiliter humeris de loco ad locum ferens, Normannos hortabatur, ut quamtotius persequerentur hostes non longe ante illos turpiter fugientes. Quibus recedentibus, previo pastore silvarum lustra carpens, tandem post triduum Cinomannis venit, vepribus et sentibus miserabiliter pedes ac tibias cruentatus.

This episode, known to modern historians as the "Battle of Tillières," took place in 1013 or 1014.¹¹ There is no reason to doubt the historicity of William's account, though the latter part of

⁶ Tillières-sur-Avre (Eure).

⁷ Néel, viscount of Coutances.

⁸ Raoul I of Toeny, lord of Conches.

⁹ Hugh III, count of the Maine, 992-1015.

¹⁰ Galeran I, count of Meulan.

¹¹ This date is that fixed by Pfister: *Études sur le règne de Robert le Pieux*, p. 215, note 1. It has been accepted by Lot: *Fidèles ou vassaux*, p. 265, and by Latouche, *op. cit.*, p. 18, note 8, though the latter expresses some doubts on the subject.

the story may be tinted a little with Norman prejudice.¹² The resemblances to the story told in the *Chançon de Guillelme* are evident. In both stories we find (1) a coward count, who (2) flees in disgrace from the battlefield, (3) loses his armor and war-horse, (4) gets mixed with a flock of sheep, and (5) arrives home in shameful state. On the other hand, the differences in detail are so marked as to exclude a direct imitation on either side. We find nothing in William of Jumièges corresponding to the incident of the gallows, the robbery of Tybalt's armor by Girard, nor the ram's head in the stirrup. On the other hand, Tybalt is not disguised as Count Hugh is in William's story, nor does he shout encouragement to the victors.

Notwithstanding these differences, the parallel is so marked that some explanation is evidently called for. Three hypotheses, it seems to me, are possible:

(1) The resemblances may be purely accidental. The writer of the *chanson*, desiring to draw a picture of a coward count, hit upon some incidents which resemble those of a similar story told by a chronicler. Such a coincidence is by no means impossible. If such be the case, and we have no means of disproving it, the anecdote of Count Hugh will have value only as illustrative material.

(2) The author of the *Chançon* may have been acquainted with the work of William of Jumièges. The earliest redaction of the latter's *Gesta* dates from about 1070.¹³ The *Chançon de Guillelme* is probably later than that; how much later no one can say.¹⁴ The poet, to judge by his language, was a Norman, who may have used the incident related by his monkish contemporary, adapting it to his general scheme. He may even have visited the monastery of Jumièges, and picked up the anecdote there. This explanation, since M. Bédier's demonstration of the way in which the poets of the *chansons* de geste have exploited monkish material, is not without some degree of plausibility.

(3) Or, lastly, the anecdote related by William may have been

¹² Latouche, *op. cit.*, p. 19, note 2 says: "Ce récit a peut-être été légèrement défiguré par la légende."

¹³ See Marx, Introduction to his edition, p. xv.

¹⁴ See Suchier, introduction to his edition of the poem, p. xxix ff. Suchier places the composition of the poem about 1080.

handed down orally among the Normans and have been incorporated in the poem in the changed form we find there. William's narrative produces on my mind the effect of a "good story," invented or embellished by the entourage of the Norman dukes at the expense of their enemies. As such, it may well have been transmitted by word of mouth as a choice anecdote, *ad maiorem gloriam Normannorum*, to the days of the poet or his older contemporary, the chronicler. That a true "epic tradition" containing such an anecdote existed, is hardly credible. Apart from the inherent improbability of such a theory, neither the episode itself nor the personages involved are important enough to justify such a tradition. But if such a story was known to William of Jumièges (and it is known to no other chronicler), he must have heard it from the Norman seigneurs whose forefathers it glorifies. The poet likewise may have heard it from one of them, and adapted it to his purposes.

This parallel, whether it be regarded as established or not, suggests a further inquiry: Did not the authors of the preserved chansons de geste exploit contemporary or nearly contemporary history more than has as yet been assumed? It is now generally accepted that the ideas, moral, social and religious, of the poets, are those of their own time, without archaic coloring. Why could not the poets likewise have used persons or events of their time, to illustrate the age of Charlemagne? That this was done sometimes, has been proved for two cases at least, the *Lorrains*¹⁵ and the *Prise de Cordres et de Seville*.¹⁶ Indeed, I should like to propound this question, as a fruitful subject for investigation: whether the series of epics dealing with rebellious vassals or in general with the attitude of the nobility to royalty, may not well have been inspired by the events of the eleventh and twelfth centuries? Louis VI, Louis VII and Philip Augustus¹⁷ had just as many difficulties with their turbulent barons as the legendary Charles and Louis of the epics. To

¹⁵ See Lot: *L'Elément historique de Garin le Lorrain* (*Mélanges G. Monod*, Paris, 1896).

¹⁶ See Denssianu, Introduction to his edition of this chanson, p. xlvii ff.

¹⁷ See especially Luchaire: *La société française au temps de Philippe-Auguste*, Paris, 1909, especially Chap. VIII. Luchaire uses the chansons as illustrating the chronicles, and vice versa.

take a specific case, may not some of the characteristics of the arch-rebel of Charlemagne, Renaud "of Montauban," have been suggested by the character and career of the arch-rebel of Philip Augustus, Renaud of Dammartin, count of Boulogne?¹⁸ I should like also to see a comparison made between the struggles of Louis VI with the rebellious seigneurs of the Ile-de-France, as related by Suger, and the many similar struggles in the epics. If this influence be admitted, the parallel I have indicated between the Tybalt-episode of the *Chançon de Guillelme* and the incident related by William of Jumièges will fall into place, as one of a series of figures or episodes of nearly contemporary history exploited by the authors of the chansons and adapted, with much skill, to the general epic framework.

WILLIAM P. SHEPARD

HAMILTON COLLEGE

¹⁸ See Ch. Malo: *Un grand feudataire, Renaud de Dammartin*, Paris, 1898.

THE FLAG OF PORTUGAL IN HISTORY AND LEGEND

THE first flag of Portugal appears to have been a simple one, consisting of a white field bearing a blue cross. These were the arms of Henrique of Burgundy. This Henrique was the son of Henri, second son of Robert, duke of Burgundy, who was the son of Robert the Saint, king of France, the son of Hugh Capet. Henrique had come to Spain about the last decade of the eleventh century to aid Alfonso VI, king of Castile and Leon, in his frequent wars against the Moors. The participation of foreigners in these expeditions against the infidels was an early manifestation of the spirit which showed itself, a little later, in the Crusades, a spirit in which religious fervor, desire of military glory, love of adventure, or the hope of gain predominated, according to the character of the individual. Whatever may have been his motives, Henrique did good service against the Moors, and gained favor with Alfonso, the more so perhaps because he was the nephew of his queen, Constance. Alfonso gave him the hand of his daughter Teresa (whose mother was not Constance, but a former wife or favorite of his, by name Jimena de Guzman), and the county of Portugal as her dowry. Portugal was smaller then than it is now, for the Moors were in possession of the southern part of the country as far north as the Tagus; on the other hand, the southern portion of the present Spanish province of Galicia was then joined to the county of Portugal. It is true that Alfonso could not give undisputed and peaceful possession of this territory to his daughter and son-in-law. Henrique fought many a battle against the infidels, in which he was invariably the conqueror, and he was not so absorbed in domestic warfare that he could not find time to seek enemies elsewhere, for in the year 1103 he set out for the Holy Land to fight against the infidels, following the example of Godfrey of Bouillon, who was his kinsman, as some say, and who had taken Jerusalem in 1099. Perhaps it was on his return in 1105 that Henrique placed a blue cross on the white shield which he had at first used. He may have been influenced in the choice of white and blue by the

fact that this combination was used by the house of France, to which he belonged.

At the death of Henrique in 1112, his son Affonso Henriques (Affonso, the son of Henrique) was still a minor, and his energetic and ambitious mother Teresa considered Portugal as her own, by right of inheritance from her father. But her infatuation with the powerful Spanish count, Fernando Perez de Trava, whom many believe that she married, offended the Portuguese, and they rallied to the cause of the young Affonso, who took arms against his mother to gain control of the country—which he in his turn claimed by right of inheritance from Count Henrique. Teresa was defeated, and if not thrown into chains by her angry son, as some old chroniclers write, she was at least exiled, and had to relinquish her pretensions to sovereignty. Affonso then devoted himself to extending his dominions southwards, and gained many towns from the Moors. Finally, on the 25th of July, 1139, he encamped on the plains of Ourique, in the province of Alemtejo. This is the generally accepted scene of the great battle which followed, although Dr. Teofilo Braga believes that the most probable location was further north, about 24 kil. (about 14 miles) from Coimbra. Five Moorish kings with an army of three hundred thousand men, assembled from Portugal, Spain and Africa, had come to check the victorious southward progress of Affonso, and, to oppose this army—if we are to believe the early chroniclers—Affonso had only thirteen thousand Portuguese. A later writer makes the number forty thousand. Making all allowances for patriotic exaggeration, it is evident that the Portuguese were greatly outnumbered. But Affonso's confidence of victory, inspired by previous successes, was increased by a vision which is firmly established in the legendary and poetic traditions of the country, although not unnaturally disputed by historians. It is said that when Affonso, seated in his tent at night, was reading the history of Gideon's miraculous victory over the Midianites, a venerable hermit appeared to him and told him to go out alone at midnight in the fields. Affonso obeyed, and there he saw a vision of the crucified Christ, promising him victory and foretelling a glorious future for the country. Affonso made known this vision to his army, and the sol-

diers, filled with enthusiasm, proclaimed their young leader king of Portugal; and then advanced to give battle to the Moorish host with a courage and resolution which supplied their lack of numbers. Their confidence was not disappointed; the victory was signal and complete. According to tradition, it was on this occasion that the arms which Portugal has ever since used were adopted. These arms consisted of five shields azure, in memory of the five Moorish kings who were conquered—or was it in memory of the five wounds of Christ, as Affonso had been commanded in the divine vision? On these five shields there were represented a varying number of besants, or pieces of money. In heraldry these pieces are supposed to signify either that the user had been captured by the Saracens and had been released on payment of a ransom, or that he had acquired the right of coining money, which was a royal or semi-royal privilege. This right Affonso certainly enjoyed. He had used, at least in the early years of his military career, the white shield with a blue cross which his father had borne, and it has been suggested that he would naturally represent these besants by nailing upon the two strips of blue leather which formed the cross, silver bosses, such as were then used in the ornamentation of objects of leather. But again tradition has her word to say—that the besants were in memory of the thirty pieces of money for which Judas sold Christ to the Jews. This is the version which Camoens adopts in the *Lusiad*, explaining that there were five pieces on each escutcheon, and that the sum of thirty was made up by counting twice those on the middle of the five escutcheons, which were arranged *em aspa*, that is, above and below the center besant two pieces were placed vertically and one at either side horizontally, thus forming a cross.

Já fica vencedor o Lusitano,
Recolhendo os tropheos e presa rica:
Desbaratado e roto o Mouro Hispano,
Tres dias o grão Rei no campo fica.
Aqui pinta no branco escudo ufano,
Que agora esta victoria certifica,
Cinco escudos azues esclarecidos,
Em sinal destes cinco Reis vencidos.

E nestes cinco escudos pinta os trinta
 Dinheiros, por que Deos fôra vendido,
 Escrevendo a memoria em varia tinta,
 Daquelle de quem foi favorecido:
 E cada hum dos cinco, cinco pinta;
 Porque assi fica o numero cumprido,
 Contando duas vezes o do meio
 Dos cinco azues, que em cruz pintando veio.

Os Lusíadas, III, 53, 54.

The legendary account is so interwoven in Portuguese history and literature, and a knowledge of it is so essential for the understanding of allusions, that one cannot afford to neglect it even if one rejects it entirely as a fabrication of priests and poets. As has been stated, the number of these besants varied; sometimes they were thirteen, and this was accounted for by saying that they represented the thirteen thousand Portuguese engaged in the battle. The crest of this coat-of-arms was the Serpent of Moses, accounted the prototype of the Cross.

At Affonso's death in 1185 he was succeeded by his son, Sancho I, who used arms consisting of a field argent bearing five azure *escudetes*, or escutcheons. It has been suggested that this was only a variation from the primitive blue cross, for, as a modern Portuguese writer very reasonably observes, it is but natural to conclude that the arms of Affonso must have been much worn in the course of his long series of campaigns against the Moors, and that he would take pride in showing to what hard use they had been subjected. The blue leather would have disappeared in places where it was not protected by the nails. These were no doubt placed at the point where the two strips were joined and at the extremities of either piece, so that when the intermediate portions were worn away five unconnected escutcheons would appear.

The flag and arms seem to have remained without important changes till the reign of Affonso III (1248-1279). Affonso was the younger brother of Sancho II, who was a weak man, completely under the control of his ambitious wife, Dona Mencia de Haro. The Portuguese became disgusted with the abuses which Sancho's indolence encouraged and called upon Affonso, who was of a more resolute and warlike character, to take the place of his brother as

king of Portugal. The change was effected in 1245, after a little fruitless resistance on Sancho's part; three years later he died in Toledo, whither he had fled, and Affonso became undisputed king of Portugal. He now thought that it would be to his advantage to make an alliance with Alfonso VI, king of Castile and Leon, by marrying his daughter Beatrice. He had been previously married to Matilde, countess of Boulogne, whose objections to a divorce proved unavailing. Beatrice brought as her dowry certain cities of Algarve, that southern end of Portugal which remained longest in the possession of the Moors. According to one tradition, the seven castles on a field of red, as at present known, were assumed on this occasion; according to another tradition, Affonso assumed the seven castles when he completed the conquest of Algarve and gave Portugal her final European boundaries. Still another explanation of the castles may be mentioned, since it is probably the best, viz., that they were an adaptation of the arms borne by the royal family of Castile, which used the castles in allusion to those from which the country is supposed to derive its name, and which Affonso assumed, as a border surrounding the escutcheons, in commemoration of his marriage with Beatrice.

A book indeed might be written on the many variations of the arms and flag, giving the contradictory explanations of the origin of every change, and setting forth the arguments supporting or invalidating them, but a summary will serve the present purpose. The number of the castles underwent various changes and was not fixed till the time of Sebastian (1557-1578), when the number of seven was definitely adopted. The number of the besants was determined in the reign of João I (1385-1433), when they were permanently reduced to five, and it was from this time, it seems probable, that the arms received the popular designation of the *Quinas*, that is, the Fives, from their resemblance to the five of dice.

This flag waved over many a field, in hard-fought battles against the Moors in southern Portugal; it was carried to Spain by Affonso IV, when he responded to the call of his son-in-law, Alfonso XI of Castile, and gave him signal aid against the immense army of Moors which had assembled near the Salado in 1340, when 200,000 infidels were killed. It was seen also, sad to say, in wars against

the Christian rulers of Spain, sometimes in defeat, often in victory, notably at the great and decisive battle of Aljubarrota, when João I of Portugal defeated Juan I of Castile, who laid claim to the throne of Portugal through his Portuguese wife, Beatriz.

The first time—to revert to the early period—that the flag was seen beyond the limits of the peninsula was in 1180 or 1184, when the Portuguese admiral, Fuas Roupinho, after defeating the Moorish vessels which had been pillaging the coast towns of Portugal, carried the war to Ceuta on the coast of Morocco. His first expedition was successful, and he returned in triumph; but on his second expedition fortune was against him, and, outnumbered by the Moorish fleet, he met the death of a martyr for the Faith. For more than two centuries after this, Portugal was occupied at home or in wars with Spain, but in 1415 João I, with his sons, undertook the re-conquest of Ceuta. The city could not resist the furious assault of the Portuguese, and was forced to surrender on the first day (August 21st, or 15th, according to some). Ceuta carried on an extensive trade with the East by sea and land, and an old chronicler tells how in the first ardor of victory the soldiers slashed open the sacks of spices with which the storehouses of the city were filled, and how the streets were strewn with pepper and cinnamon, as they were with rushes on great feast days, and how fragrant these spices were, trampled under foot in the hot sun, till the more thriftily-disposed began to collect whatever was not ruined.

This was the beginning of Portugal's wonderful period of discovery and conquest. Affonso V, grandson of João I, extended the Portuguese possessions on the coast of Morocco, and Portuguese sailors explored the African coast southward league by league, setting up *Padrões* as a sign of their having landed, and as a guide to those who might follow them. These *Padrões* were stone pillars of fourteen or fifteen palms in height, surmounted by a cross. They were engraved with the arms of Portugal, and bore two inscriptions, one in Portuguese and the other in Latin, declaring the name of the reigning king and that of the captain who made the discovery, and the day and year in which it was made. One can imagine the thrill of pleasure a homesick Portuguese sailor must have felt at finding one of the pillars, giving a silent assurance that

his countrymen had landed there before him, and had left this sign to help him. They were scattered along the African coast, in the mangrove swamps of Mozambique and the Zaire, and on the barren and desolate shore of southwest Africa. The natives must have wondered what they meant, when they gathered around them after the strange visitors had sailed away.

At first the explorers were content with slow progress, for the dangers, real and imaginary, of such voyages, were very great. But experience made them bolder, and the discovery of the astrolabe by astronomers in the employ of João II (1481-1495) made navigation easier. In 1486 Bartholomeu Dias rounded the southern extremity of Africa, unknown till then, and the *Quinas* were set up on the little island of Santa Cruz, beyond the great cape. Dias called it the *Cabo das Tormentas* (the Cape of Storms), from the frightful winds which he had experienced there, but when, on his return, he reported the discovery to the king, João II, he was so pleased with it and the prospect which it opened of finding a water way to India, which was the great object of all these voyages, that he renamed the stormy cape the *Cabo da Boa Esperança*, a name still retained—philosophically passing over the terrors of a voyage in which he had not taken part. In 1497 Vasco da Gama sailed from Lisbon and carried the flag around Africa, and set up on the coast of Malabar a *Padrão* bearing the *Quinas*, thus realizing the Portuguese dream of many years.

The triumphant flag was a feared and familiar sight on the African and Indian coasts for many years afterwards. It floated over the city of Ormuz in the Persian Gulf, which was so rich that the natives declared that the world was a ring made as a setting for its most precious jewel, the city of Ormuz. It was carried to the Spice Islands, to China, where the peninsula of Macao was given to Portugal, with some restrictions, in reward for defeating the pirates. It was probably the first European flag seen in Japan, where Portuguese missionaries were so successful in converting the people that the Japanese government, alarmed at the possibility of more material aggressions, put an end to Christianity in the country for the time by a massacre of Oriental ruthlessness.

The flag saw the triumph of the Almeidas, father and son;

Albuquerque raised it over the conquered cities of Goa, Ormuz and Malacca. It was defended with unsurpassed courage during the two sieges of Diu, and it was hailed with joy when João de Castro, one of the greatest and best of the Portuguese governors of India, brought sorely needed reinforcements to the beleaguered city. It was flying over the ship of Diego Lopes de Sequeira in 1509 before Malacca, and at the capture of the city by the Portuguese under the great Albuquerque in 1511.

João Ruiz de Sa writes of the glories of the Portuguese arms :

E direy primeyramente
das altas quinas rreaes,
mandadas per deos, as quaes
jaa conhece tanta gente
por senhoras naturaes.
que de Ceyta atee os Chijs,
no mar rroxo & Abaxijs,
Yndia, Malaqua, Armuz,
com a espera & com a cruz
durarão tee fym dos fiins.

Westward the flag was planted in Brazil, and the Cortereal family carried it far north, as far as the coast of Greenland. The name of Labrador, given in honor of João Fernandes o Labrador, or Lavrador, that is, the Farmer or Landowner, still testifies to the discoveries of the Portuguese in those regions, for *o Lavrador* was the first who gave news of the existence of that country.

The same flag would have been the first to be carried around the world if it had not been for the ill-judged economy of king Manuel I. For the Portuguese soldier, Fernão Magalhães, was so angered by Manuel's refusal to increase a pension he had richly earned in Africa and India that he offered his services to Spain to discover a way to the coveted Spice Islands by sailing to the west, and so it was under the Spanish flag that the ship *Victoria* first sailed over the uncharted waters of the Pacific and made the circuit of the world.

An important change in the flag was the addition of the arms of Brazil, when that rich colony was created a kingdom united to the mother country in 1816. The arms of Brazil have an inter-

esting history of their own. In 1808, when Napoleon was carrying everything before him in Central Europe and had turned his eyes southward to the Iberian peninsula, João, afterwards known as João VI, was regent of Portugal for his insane mother. On the approach of the French army João prudently, if ingloriously, determined to escape to Brazil, where he was enthusiastically received. His coming gave a great impulse to the development of the colony, which in 1815 was raised to the rank of a kingdom, united to Portugal and Algarve. In a decree dated the 13th of May, 1816, João gave to Brazil as arms an armillary sphere of gold on a field of blue. The armillary sphere was also used in the arms of the united kingdoms, the Portuguese arms being placed upon the sphere, and the whole surmounted by a crown. This did not continue long in use, for on the 12th of October, 1822, Brazil declared her independence. When João returned to Portugal in April, 1821, Brazil, fearing to lose the advantage she had enjoyed for a short time as the seat of government, determined upon independence as the only means of national preservation. Portugal was obliged to acquiesce in this, and resumed her former arms.

Why did João choose the armillary sphere as the arms of Brazil? Because this sphere was the device of Manuel I, king of Portugal in 1500, when Brazil was discovered. Manuel was apparently not predestined to be king, for he was the son of Fernando, second son of Duarte, king of Portugal, while João II was the son of the eldest son, Affonso V. João II had a son, Affonso, whose death left Manuel the next heir to the throne. Five years later, in 1495, João died, and Manuel began to reign at a time when Portugal was at the dawn of her greatest prosperity. In 1483, when he was only fourteen years of age, the king had given him as his device an armillary sphere, then called in Portuguese *Espera* or *Spera*, with the motto *In Deo*, that is *Spera in Deo*, according to the heraldic rule which requires that the device shall not give the complete sense without the motto, nor the motto without the device. This was, with some reason, considered as myteriously prophetic, for Manuel's prospect of succeeding to the throne was then very slight, and such a device seemed to forecast his advent to power and to allude also to possible discoveries, conquests and possessions

in the four quarters of the world, such, indeed, as later, during his reign, were the extensive acquisitions made by the Portuguese in Africa, Asia and America.

During this period of great maritime and military activity, every other faculty seemed to be awakened to its fullest development, as often happens in the life of nations. Portuguese architecture felt this inspiration, as is shown in edifices where Moresque, Byzantine, Norman and Gothic styles are combined with an originality which makes the whole an expression of national aspiration. In their ornamentation the effect of the Eastern discoveries of the Portuguese is manifest, the flowers and birds of the tropics being frequently introduced, and in the midst of these the Sphere often appears, being thus inseparably connected with the Golden Age of Portugal. The device was also used on gold coins which were struck at Manuel's orders, having the sphere on one side and a crown on the other. Albuquerque, after the conquest of Goa, also had gold, silver and copper money coined, to which he gave the name of *Esphas*, which had the sphere on one side and the Cross of the Order of Christ on the other. All this shows how intimately the sphere was connected with a period of which the Portuguese are justly proud.

On the 18th of October, 1830, another change in the flag took place. It was decreed that the national flag should consist of two vertical bands of blue and white, the blue being next to the staff, and the royal arms being placed on the union of the two bands. The nineteenth century saw the flag carried into the interior of Africa, and Serpa Pinto, Capello and other Portuguese explorers did brilliant service to their country. Ferreira da Silva Porto explored the sources of the Zambesi and, as Captain of Bihé and Bailondo, defended the flag bravely for many years, until, fearful of his inability longer to do so in consequence of intrigues between Europeans and natives, he put an end to his life.

The final change in the flag was planned in anticipation of the Revolution which established the Republic. Republican sentiment had been growing steadily in Portugal for years, and many had thought that the mother country might follow sooner than she did the example of her former colony, Brazil. The extravagance and

incompetence of King Carlos had exasperated the people; Franco's efforts to place the country on a better financial basis were patriotic and well-meant, but his arbitrary methods of cancelling the king's debts in an attempt to start afresh, provoked much criticism, even though his motives were above reproach. The assassination of Carlos and the Prince Royal on February 1, 1908, did not quench the desire for the overthrow of the monarchy, and Manuel's tenure of power was uncertain from the first. Bernardino Machado, Affonso Costa, Brito Camacho, Antonio José d'Almeida, Teófilo Braga and other strong Republicans continued to organize quietly, and in a congress held at Oporto in April, 1910, the question of a flag for the new movement was discussed. The moderates were in favor of retaining the former flag, simply suppressing the crown, but the advanced party advocated a more radical change. It was Dr. Teófilo Braga who chose the new colors, green for hope and red for the pernicious doctrine of Comtist Positivism, of which unfortunately that learned, patriotic, austere and humane Portuguese is a supporter. The acid green of the first days of the Republic was later replaced by a darker shade, while the red is of a brilliant tone. The green is next to the staff, and on the union of these two vertical bands is placed the armillary sphere, and superimposed on it, the national coat-of-arms—the blue *Quinas* with the five besants on each, on a white field, surrounded by a red border bearing the seven castles—unchanged except for the omission of the cross and crown.

In October, 1910, the time was ripe for a decisive blow, and the Revolution, so long planned, was swiftly accomplished. Even regiments of which the Republican leaders had felt uncertain were quick to join the movement, and the war-ships on the Tagus gave it most effective support, Machado dos Santos, Lieutenant Pereira and Captain Maia of the Sixteenth Infantry being among those who especially distinguished themselves. The red and green banner was raised on the *Adamastor* and the *São Rafael*, and received its first recognition from a foreign power when the Brazilian armored cruiser *São Paulo* fired a salute. Manuel, whom even the monarchists could hardly call more than a well-intentioned ruler, fled without delay, his escape being perhaps no more gratifying to him

than to the Republicans, who did not wish to make him a martyr, and the Republic was soon established by a revolution, which, as its leaders congratulated themselves, was one of the most humane of all similar upheavals.

Probably the last time that the old flag of the monarchy was seen on a Portuguese ship was in December, 1910, when the Portuguese bark *Neptuno* came into the port of São Thomé, a Portuguese island in the Gulf of Guinea, flying the blue and white flag, for although it was two months after the Revolution, the *Neptuno* had just returned from a long voyage and had not heard of the fall of the monarchy. The cruiser *São Rafael* was at anchor in the port, and at the suggestion of the commissioner, Lieutenant Maldonado, the commander of the *São Rafael*, sent the red and green flag of the Republic to the captain of the *Neptuno*, Manuel Martins Arroja, who at once ran up the new flag and returned the monarchical banner, which Lieutenant Maldonado had requested with the intention of presenting it to the Museum of the Revolution as perhaps the last flag of the former régime raised on a Portuguese ship. The flag was *bastante usada* (much worn), as befitted the last representative of the fallen monarchy.

Although there was remarkably little blood shed in effecting this radical change in the form of government, which, as Provisional President Braga has observed, was realized in a way more spiritual than material, the new flag was not destined to long peace. When the Great War broke out in 1914 Portugal was not at once directly involved, although her ancient treaties with England made it certain that she would fight on the side of the Allies if she entered the conflict. Till March, 1916, Portugal was in the singular situation of fighting against a nation with which she was not at war. German forces invaded Portuguese Angola and there were frequent encounters with Portuguese troops, but diplomatic relations between the two countries were not broken off. On the 23d of February, 1916, Captain Leote do Rego took forcible possession of thirty-six German and Austrian vessels detained in the Tagus, and running up the red and green flag of Portugal, he saluted it with a salvo of twenty-one guns from the Portuguese fleet. This was followed by the seizure of German ships in Por-

tugal's colonies and island possessions, and on March the 9th Germany declared war on Portugal in consequence of her action. Since then there has been more fighting between the two nations in both East and West Africa, and Portuguese expeditionary forces are coöperating with the French troops on the western front, so that the flag of Portugal is now floating beside that of the sister Republic over the blood-drenched plains of northern France.

KATHARINE WARD PARMELEE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

NOTES ON PROFESSOR M. A. SCOTT'S ELIZABETHAN
TRANSLATIONS FROM THE ITALIAN

I BEG to submit to the ROMANIC REVIEW a few notes on Spanish Literature in connection with Professor Mary Augusta Scott's *Elizabethan Translations from the Italian*.¹

At the very beginning of the book, on page ix, we read:

In the spring of 1892, I was preparing to go to Europe to study for the doctor's degree. At that time, the University of Zürich was the only European university that admitted women to the degree of doctor of philosophy.

At the time indicated Miss Scott might have obtained her doctor's degree at Paris; or at Göttingen, as Sónya Kovalévskaya did in 1874.

On page xiv Dr. Scott mentions her own suggestion as to the possible source of the episode of Benedick and Beatrice, without stating what other investigators have done in the same line (see *Magyar Shakespeare-Tár*, VII, 269).

The reference to Ireland on page xlvii seems to me ungracious, particularly at the present time, when the banshee's plaintive cry is heard all over the Island of Saints and Scholars. By way of vicarious amends, I may as well call the author's attention to an allusion to Don Quijote's horse in an old Irish poem:

Finlay, the red-haired bard, said this:

Gael-like is every leap of the dun horse,
A Gael she is in truth.
It is she who conquers and wins,
In all that I'll now sing.
The praise of speed to her limbs,
In every fierce assault.
Marked, and famous her strength,
While quiet at the house of prayer.
The birds are they who could,
Strive with her in the race.

¹ Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916.

Not false is the fame of that horse,
The steed both sturdy and swift,
Liker she was to Duseivlin,
Than to the beast of Lamacha.

(*The Dean of Lismore's Book*, edited by the Rev.
Thomas M'Laughlan. Edinburgh, 1862, p. 112.)

Dr. Scott mentions on page xlix and elsewhere *The Triumphes of Oriana*, but does not say that Oriana was the name given to Elizabeth by the Spanish visitors after the heroine of *Amadis*.

A piece of advice to modern scientists on page li may wisely be omitted in a future edition, unless the credentials are duly produced. The charge against Cardano of having filched from Tartaglia (p. lxiii) has been substantiated, as can be learned from any History of Mathematics.

In connection with books on horsemanship (p. lxiv), Mr. Carleton Brown's paper (*The Library*, Third Series, III, 152) ought to have been mentioned.

From this point I shall register my remarks under the corresponding bibliographical numbers of Dr. Scott's work.

6.—The fact that Juan de Flores' *Historia de Grisel y Mirabella* is the Spanish original of the story, has been well established by Dr. Stiefel in his well known paper (*Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, Neue Folge XII, 241, Weimar, 1898). The oldest edition of the work bears no date (see Menéndez y Pelayo, *Orígenes de la Novela*, tomo I, p. cccxxxvi, Madrid, 1905). The Sevilla edition of 1524 has been reprinted and is easily accessible.

The Spanish Tiresias attempts to show in his novel that woman deserves chief blame in sexual irregularities. That is just the point in which Shakespeare disagrees with Whetstone, from whom he borrowed the plot of his *Measure for Measure*. Whetstone says: "for the man was helde to bee the greatest offender, and therefore had the severest punishment" (*Shakespeare's Library*, III, 156, London, 1875), while Shakespeare takes the Spanish point of view:

Then was your sin of heauier kinde then his.
(*Measure for Measure*, II, 3, 28.) Cf. *Englische Studien*, XL, 153.

18.—The original is, of course, Spanish, not Greek, and has been reprinted in *Revue Hispanique*, XXV, 220.

28.—This story has been traced to a Spanish source (*Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, L, 146).

34.—The first edition of *Palmerin de Oliva* is that of 1511 (Wolf, *Studien zur Geschichte der spanischen und portugiesischen Nationalliteratur*, Berlin, 1859, p. 185). I own the Toledo edition of 1580. This book is full of motifs and as it antedates the novels of Gelli and Bandello, it may not be amiss to mention that *Circe* and the *Dumb Knight* are familiar figures to the readers of this old romance. Dr. Koepfel has also pointed out the possibility of the *Tragedy of Hoffman* being indebted to this selfsame Spanish novel (*Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, C, 23). I called attention to another motif in the *Cultura Española*, XII, 1023, and XV, 733.

38.—An adumbration of the motif of the *Curioso Impertinente* will be found in *I Trattenimenti di Scipion Bargagli*, Venetia, MDXCII, p. 106 (the first edition bears the date of 1587).

41.—The first edition is that of Salamanca, of 1511. The book is again full of motifs to which attention was called a long time ago (*Studi di filologia moderna*, I, 290). Such are those of Pigafetta's *Patagonian*, that of the love-lorn maiden 'Fair Ricarda' and perhaps that of Caliban, certainly that of the Servant-Monster.

48.—It is not clear to me why Bartholomew Yonge's direct rendering of the *Diana* from the Spanish original has found a place here. Ticknor's story as to his owning a copy of the *Diana*, dated 1542, long since exploded by Fitzmaurice-Kelly (*Revue Hispanique*, II, 304), is repeated without comment. This is a chronic error with the American writers on English literature, and has passed even into many an edition of the *Two Gentlemen* in Shakespeare's works.

50.—Belianis is still popular in Ireland.

58.—The original of the story about Scipio Nasica and Ennius will be found in Cicero's *De Oratore*, 2, 68, 276.

64.—The original is French as far as my knowledge goes, viz., *Histoire des tragiques Amours d'Hipolite & d'Isabelle*, Nyort, 1597. Middleton died in 1627 and could hardly have utilized the English translation.

80.—Pope's verses remind one of Voltaire's well-known quatrain:

Confidants du Très Haut, substances éternelles,
Qui brûlez de ses feux, qui couvrez de vos ailes
Le trône où votre maître est assis parmi vous,
Parlez! du grand Newton n'étiez-vous pas jaloux?

There is also a Portuguese poem entitled 'Newton' by José Agostinho de Macedo (Lisboa, 1813).

86.—I attempted to show Warner's indebtedness to *Camões*, perhaps not quite successfully (*Revista Lusitana*, XIII, 133).

90.—Another parallel to Shakespeare's description of a storm has been published in *Magyar Shakespeare-Tár*, VI, 238. The source of the Sea Voyage has been traced to W. Warner's *Pan his Syrinx* (*Anglia*, XXXIII, 332).

132.—My copy of Strada is that of Milan, 1626.

158.—The claim that *Laelia* is the source of the *Twelfth Night* is due to those who never have seen the Latin play. No attempt worthy of attention has been made to substantiate the claim since the publication of the play.

188.—For *work* read *world*.

277.—American ownership of rare books ought to have been indicated in every case, as far as ascertainable. I greatly doubt that there is in America no copy of Florio (1598) except mine (which cost only thirty shillings).

390.—Again a disparaging remark about Ireland. A scholarly account of the *Book of Mac Durnan* would be more acceptable.

394.—Coccio's translation of *Leucippe* is mentioned, but no reference is made to the efforts to show Shakespeare's and other Elizabethans' indebtedness to this novel (cf. *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, XLI, 186; XLVI, 118, *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, III, 247; *Modern Language Notes*, XXIX, 63; *New York Nation*, XCII, 444).

As to omissions, I find that numerous English plays referable to Italian sources, such as the *Common Conditions*, Chapman's *May-Day*, or Marston's *What you will* (*Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, XL, 24; XXXV, 180, and XLI, 186), are not even mentioned. To such omissions is due the fact that the names of some of the great-

est investigators, like that of Dr. Stiefel, are conspicuous by their absence from the Index, while the authors of mere remarks occupy there a place of honor. How Marie Luise Gothein has been "put on the index" (in another sense), in spite of her beautiful book, *Geschichte der Gartenkunst* (Jena, 1914), is beyond my comprehension. I am well aware of the difficulty of procuring foreign books at the present time, but I have no doubt that Dr. Scott will find Marie Gothein's work in some American library. Among the "Grammars and Dictionaries," the following should have found a place: *Colloques ou Dialogues, avec un dictionnaire en six langues: Flamen, Anglois, Alleman, François, Espagnol & Italien*. Anvers, 1579.

JOSEPH DE PEROTT

WORCESTER, MASS.

[Editorial note: We cannot emphasize too strongly the usefulness and conscientiousness of this volume. It is the product not only of an enthusiastic scholar but also of a personality which leaves its visible impress on the body of the work as well as on the entertaining preface. This word of appreciation may be tempered, perhaps, with one general criticism. Dr. Scott is interested in the question of English translations of Italian from the point of view of her preoccupation with the English civilization of the Renaissance. It is questionable whether the volume as a bibliography has not been marred rather than improved by this wider interest. Dr. Scott gives little evidence of having studied profoundly the Italian Renaissance in England. Her first chapter adds little that is significant to the present state of science on this question. It shows a persistent and regrettable neglect of Dr. Scott's many and distinguished predecessors in the field. Furthermore, the successive items in her bibliography are cluttered with a straggling commentary hardly ever free from errors, serious, or—if such there may be—negligible. The remarks published above by Mr. Perott, containing, as will be seen, extensive corrections, direct attention to only a small portion of what might be criticized in Dr. Scott's text. The value of the book consists almost exclusively in its bibliography. In any succeeding studies of this character, Dr. Scott will do well to keep her orientation as a bibliographer free from the distractions of her interests in social and intellectual history. This will save her work from any air of pretentiousness and at the same time make it more easy to use.—A. A. L.]

DELLA CASA'S *GALATEO* IN SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND

I N that valuable volume, *Elizabethan Translations from the Italian*, by M. A. Scott (1916), we are told that "the two great books on manners" by the Italians of the Renaissance are "*Il Cortegiano*, with one hundred and forty-three editions, and *Galateo*, with fifty-six editions."¹ The author adds that in her "study of the literary influence of the Italian Renaissance, it [*Galateo*] is the second most popular book"; and that of the fifty-six editions she has met with, fourteen are in English.²

These fourteen English editions of *Galateo*, however, do not tell the whole story of the popularity of Della Casa's treatise in England. The three versions of the seventeenth century English *Galateo*, as Professor J. E. Spingarn points out, were not full translations, but were in paraphrased, loosely imitated, or epitomized form.³ Of the first and second of these, of the years 1616⁴ and 1640⁵ there was no second edition; but of the third, 1663,⁶ there were two other editions before the end of the century. Five editions in all.

To these three versions of *Galateo* in the seventeenth century must be added a fourth abbreviated version, which has been hidden from our knowledge by a change of title. It is Francis Hawkins' *Youth's Behaviour, or Decency in Conversation among Men*, a popular English book of manners of that century. Evidence of its

¹ P. 466.

² P. 466. Miss Scott does not include in her list of fourteen editions that of 1811 printed in Baltimore. It appears to be a second edition of the 1774 translation, as its title agrees with the title of that edition. A copy of the 1811 edition is found in the Library of Congress. No name of the translator is given. It appears to be a trade book and is accompanied by *The Honours of the Table with The Whole Art of Carving*.

³ Pp. 121, 122, in the Humanists' Library Edition of Robert Peterson's translation of *Galateo* (1576).

⁴ "Epitome of Good Manners" appended to the "Rich Cabinet."

⁵ Translation of "*El Galateo Espanol*" by Wm. Styles.

⁶ "The Refined Courtier."

unusual popularity is seen in the eleven editions that appeared between the years 1641 and 1684.⁷ We are told on the title page of the fifth edition, published in 1651, that it was "composed in French by grave persons for the use and benefit of their youth," and "now newly turned into English by Francis Hawkins." Nothing more is told us of the source of this translation; but a comparison of its forty-two pages at once reveals its close dependence upon *Galateo*.⁸

In Hawkins' *Youth's Behaviour* we have substantially another epitome of *Galateo*, with the addition of some less important material gleaned from other sources. In this epitomized form Della Casa's material has been subjected to a rigid method of selection and of arrangement under separate subject heads,⁹ with the omission of all illustrative or explanatory matter. The seven chapters into which the epitomized gleanings of *Galateo* are grouped in *Youth's Behaviour* are in turn subdivided into numerous unconnected paragraphs. The seven chapters correspond roughly to certain sections of Della Casa's book; but in each chapter the effort has been made to bring together all the information in the treatise that might be included under the chapter head.¹⁰ The book as a whole bears the unattractive stamp of a treatise of instruction; and shorn as it is of the illustrative and philosophical reflections of Della Casa, offers

⁷ The *British Museum Catalogue* and the *Dictionary of National Biography* know of only ten editions. I have made use of an edition in the Library of the University of Michigan which is later than the ten mentioned in the *British Museum Catalogue* and the *Dictionary of National Biography*. It bears the date of 1684 and is called *The New Youth's Behaviour*. It is made up of two parts: "I. Of your Duty towards God; II. Decency in Conversation amongst Men." The second part only reproduces Hawkins' *Youth's Behaviour*.

⁸ Della Casa's work which was first published in 1558 was translated in French first in 1562. Francis Hawkins was in all probability responsible only for the "translation," since we are told on the title page of the fifth edition that he was only eight years of age when he made this translation. I have not been able to compare his work with the *Epitome of Good Manners* appended to the *Rich Cabinet* in 1616, nor have I been able to identify the work "composed in French by grave persons for the use and benefit of their youth."

⁹ The seven chapters are: I. Of the First Duties and Ceremonies in Conversation. II. General and mixt Precepts. III. Of the Fashions of qualifying, etc. IV. Of Cloaths and Arraying the Body. V. Of Walking alone, or be it in Company. VI. Of Discourse. VII. Of Carriage at the Table.

¹⁰ For instance Chapter VI in *Youth's Behaviour* corresponds to pp. 62-92 in *Galateo*; Chapter II to pp. 17-29; Chapter VII to pp. 20-44 and to 108-110, etc., etc.

an illuminating example of seventeenth century puritan England turning to Italy, albeit unknowingly, for its popular guide in teaching manners.

A part of Chapter II has been drawn on for the following extracts, to show that *Youth's Behaviour* is derived from *Galateo*. Any one of the other chapters would have served as well for this purpose.

Galateo (1576), Hum. Lib. Ed.

P. 17: For we must not only re-fraine from such thinges as be fowle, filthy, lothsome and nastie: *but we must not so muche as name them.* And it is not only a fault to dooe such things, *but against good maner, by any act or signe to put a man in minde of them.* And therefore, it is an illfavoured fashion, *that some men use, openly to thrust their hands in what parte of their bodye they list.*

P. 27: Theis fashions to, must be left, that some men use, to *sing betweene the teethe, or playe the dromme with their fingers, or shoofle their feete.*

P. 18: And as these and like fashions offend the senses, to which they appertain: *so to grinde the teethe, to whistle, to make pitifull cries, to rubb sharpe stones together, and to file uppon Iron, do muche offend the Eares* and would be left in any case.

P. 26: Also there be some that so buckell them selves, reave, *stretch and yawne, writhing now one side, and then another,* that a man would weene, they had some fever uppon them.

Youth's Behaviour (1684).

Chapter II. General and Mixt Precepts.

§ 2. It is ill-beseeming to put one in mind of any unclean or ill-favoured thing.

§ 3. Take heed as much as thou canst in the presence of others, to put thy hand to any part of thy body, which is not ordinarily discovered, as are the hands and face: and to accustom thy self thereunto: it is well done to abstain from so doing, yea being alone.

§ 5. Sing not within thy mouth, humming to thy self, unless thou be alone, in such sort as thou canst not be heard by other. Strike not up a Drum with thy fingers or thy feet.

§ 6. Rub not thy teeth nor crash them, nor make any thing crack in such manner that thou disquiet any body.

§ 7. It is an uncivil thing to stretch out thine arms at length and writhe them hither and thither.

P. 18: So there be some kinde of men, that in *coffing*, or *neesing*, make *suche* noise, that they make a man *deafe* to here them.

§ 8. In coughing or sneezing, make not great noise, if it be possible, and send not forth any sigh, in such wise that others observe thee, without great occasion.

Pp. 18, 19: *And a man must leave to yawne muche*, not only for the respect of the matter I have saide alreadye as that it seems to proceede, of a certaine werines, that shewes that he that yawne, could better like to be elsewhere, than there in that place: as weried with the companie, their talke, and their doings.

§ 9. In yawning howl not, and thou shouldst abstain as much as thou canst to yawn, especially when thou speakest, for that sheweth one to be weary, and that one little accounteth of the company: But if thou beest constrained to yawn, by all means, for that time being, speak not, nor gape wide mouthed, but shut thy mouth with thy hand, or with thy handkerchief if it be needful, readily turning thy face another side.

P. 19: *And when thou hast blowne thy nose, use not to open thy handkerchief, to glare uppon thy snout*, as if you hadst pearles and Rubies fallen from thy braynes: for these be slovenly parts, ynough to cause men, not so much not to love us, as if they did love us, to unlove us againe.

§ 10. When thou blowest thy Nose, make not thy Nose sound like a Trumpet, and after look not within thy handkerchief. Take heed thou blow not thy Nose as children do, with thy fingers, or thy sleeves, but serve thy self of thy handkerchief.

P. 26: So then, it is a rude fashion (in my conceipte) that som men use, to lie lolling a sleepe in that place, where honest men be met together, of purpose to talke . . . and in like manner, to rise up where other men doe sit and talke, and to walke up and downe the chamber, it is no point of good maner.

§ 11. To sleep when others speak, to sit when others stand, to walk on when others stay, to speak when one should hold his peace, or hear others, are all things of ill manners: but it is permitted to a superior to walk certain places, as to a Master in his School.¹¹

¹¹ Compare, further, in *Youth's Behaviour* the passages indicated here by chapter and paragraph number with the passages in *Galateo* indicated by page number (included in parentheses): Chap. VI, 18 (116); 37 (90); 15 (86); 71 (88); 35 (61); 41 (46); 42 and 38 (86). Chap. VII, 1, 2 (108); 22 (23), etc., etc.

MORRIS P. TILLEY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ETYMOLOGIES AND ETYMOLOGICAL NOTES

UNDER this title the writer proposes to publish from time to time either new etymologies, mostly Rumanian, or addenda and corrigenda to various works of etymological reference.

I. RUMANIAN *agod*

In the Dictionary of the Rumanian Academy¹ (Vol. I, Part 1, p. 71) the above word is rendered as 'règle, ordre, organisation, mœurs, coutume, habitudes, institution, arrangement.' A more logical order of meanings would appear by separating the definitions 'mœurs, coutume, habitudes' from the others, whereby the various connotations of the word *agod* would fall into two closely related categories, viz., 'order' and 'habit.' The only authority cited in the Dictionary explains *agod* as 'treabă, rânduială, rând, plan,' meanings which are subsumed under the idea of 'order.' The meanings of 'nature, custom, habit' ('firea, obiceiul, năravul') are given, however, by Ioan Pop Reteganul in his *Povești din Popor*, Sibiu (Hermannstadt), 1895, p. 207, and there illustrated by such passages as "Bătrânii se ospătara și mâncară și beură, după cum li agodul (obiceiul) lor . . ." ("The old men feasted and ate and drank as is their wont"). *Agod* thus offers an exact parallel to Latin *mos* "die jedem eigene Art; Sitte; durch Gewohnheit festgewordener Brauch" (A. Walde).

Dicționarul Limbii Române also records the variant *ogod*. Now, in old Rumanian texts one comes across a word *ogod* with the meaning of 'pleasure, liking, contentment, favor' (cf. H. Tiktin, *Rumänisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Vol. II, p. 1084), which, as Professor Tiktin notes, goes back to a Slavic *ugodŭ* with the same meaning.² Is this word identical with our *agod*? Phoneti-

¹ *Academia Română. Dicționarul Limbii Române. . . . Tomul I. Partea I. A-B.* București, [1908-]1913; *Tomul II.* [F-H; in course of publication since 1910].

² Following in the wake of the *Lexicon Budanum* several dictionaries enter the form *ogod* and explain it as 'quiet, tranquility, repose,' etc. Although these meanings are deducible from that of the Old Rumanian word, their authenticity

cally there is every reason to believe that this is the case, for Old Church Slavic *ugodŭ* could give only Rumanian *ogod*, whence by vocalic dissimilation is obtained *agod* (cf. *altoî* < *oltoî*; *bajor* < *bojor* < *bujor*; *babon* < **bobon* < *bubon*). Semantically too the transition from 'pleasure, liking' to 'plan, order' (through some such stages as 'liking, inclination, habit, habitual action, set order') is a natural one. This is seen in such instances as Greek *ἡθεῖος*, *ἡθαῖος*, 'chéri,' besides *ἥθος*, 'coutume, usage, manière d'être, caractère'; and in their Germanic cognates, Gothic *sidus* (Old High German *situ*, 'Sitte') and Old Norse *suáss*, 'chéri,' etc. (cf. E. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Grecque*, p. 218).

Furthermore, the following passage from Dosofteiu, *Viața Sfinților* (Tiktin, *Wörterbuch*, s. v. *ogoadă*) is instructive: "Chivernisindu-o [i. e., mănăstirea] pre ogod d-zeesc"; for in it the word *ogod* may be understood as either 'liking' or 'order,' and the passage accordingly interpreted as either "arranging [the monastery] to God's liking" (Tiktin: "In gottgefälliger Weise"); or "arranging the monastery in accordance with divine plan (or order)." We may conclude, therefore, that we have in *agod* an archaic word which has survived in dialectal speech, though with a modification of its original meaning.

It may not be amiss to note in this connexion that the Rumanian word *ogodnic*, which is translated by Professor Tiktin as 'gefällig, beliebt; Liebling,' has rather the meaning of 'θεράπων, cultor' (Miklosich), like its Slavic prototype *ugodnikŭ*. The Rumanian forms *ogoadă*, *ogodă*, go back to Church Slavic *ugoda*, a word which probably existed in Old Bulgarian, but is to be found only in Russian Church Slavic texts (cf. Tiktin, *loc. cit.*; E. Berneker, *Slavisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Vol. I, p. 317; O. Den-susianu, *Histoire de la Langue Roumaine*, Vol. II, p. 109).

2. RUMANIAN (DIALECTAL) *änderete*

The Academy Dictionary (Vol. I, part 1, p. 165) says that the etymology of this word is unknown. Yet it records the conjecture is not sufficiently established to warrant consideration in the present discussion. Apparently the authors of these dictionaries have been influenced in their definition of *ogod* by the meaning of the word *ogoi*.

of Professor Rădulescu-Pogoneanu, who sees in *anderete* a corruption of German *anderwärts* with the same meaning, 'elsewhere.' That in connecting the Rumanian word with German *ander-* he was on the right track is proved by the employment of the word *ândert* in the dialect of the Transylvanian Germans (the so-called Transylvanian Saxons) in such locative expressions as *îrentândert*, 'elsewhere'; *îrestândert*, 'in another direction,' etc.³ The Rumanian word *anderete* is thus a direct reflex of *ândert*, with final *-e* added thru the influence, in all probability, of *ai(u)re*, *ainde*, *nicăire*, and other adverbs of place.

3. RUMANIAN *arolă* AND *areșcă* (*rișcă*)

Arolă și areșcă is the Rumanian phrase for the ancient, though not altogether reputable, game of pitch-and-toss. Although, according to the Dictionary of the Academy, the etymology of the two words is unknown, it is readily to be found in the Russian name of the game, which is *orëlŭ ilŭ rêška* (or *rêshotka*). Now, *arolă* is an almost exact phonetic transcription of *orëlŭ* ('head' of a coin; pronounced *ar'ol* in Russian), with an added feminine ending *-ă*, after the analogy of *areșcă*. On the other hand, *areșcă* is a reflex of Russian *rêška* ('tail' of a coin), with prothetic *a-* due to the influence of *arolă*. At Bucharest the game is known as *rișcă*, which reflects the South Russian pronunciation of *rêška*. The Academy Dictionary (Vol. I, Part 1, pp. 237, 266) records also the variants *arol* and *reșcă*.

4. RUMANIAN (DIALECTAL) *feliort*

This word is explained in the Dictionary of the Academy as "extrémité (d'un corridor dans une mine)." It is an addendum to the terminology borrowed by Rumanian miners from the German.⁴ In the language of the German miners *Ort* means "das Ende . . . eines Grubenbaues . . . in Gestein" (H. Veith, *Deutsches Bergwörterbuch*, Breslau, 1871, p. 355). And, in a restricted

³ *Siebenbürgisch-Sächsisches Wörterbuch . . . hrsg. vom Ausschuss des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde*. Strassburg i. E., 1909, vol. I, p. 113.

⁴ A number of such borrowings will be found in Ion Borcia, *Deutsche Sprachelemente im Rumänischen*. Leipzig, 1903, p. 32.

sense, *Felort* (spelled also *Fehlort*, *Fählort*; *ibid.*, p. 357), which is synonymous with *Querschlag*, is "eyn ort das man durch quersteyn treibet, auff keinem Gang oder Klufft" (quoted from a German work on mining of 1534 by Veith, *loc. cit.*, p. 416. Cf. also Grimm's *Wörterbuch* under the words *Fehlort* and *Querschlag*). *Feliort*, accordingly, almost exactly reproduces in form and meaning the obsolescent *Fehlort*. It may be worth noting that the Rumanian miners have also retained the word *ort*, in the technical sense of 'drift'.

FELICIU VEXLER

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

MISCELLANEOUS

CHAUCER, *KNIGHT'S TALE* 2012-8

AND after this, Theseus hath ysent
After a bere, and it al overspradde
With cloth of gold, the richest that he hadde.
And of the same suyte he cladde Arcite;
Upon his hondes hadde he gloves whyte;
Eek on his heed a croune of laurer grene,
And in his hond a swerd ful bright and kene.

It is well known that this comes from Boccaccio, *Teseide* II. 15¹:

E fece poi un feretro venire
Reale a sè davanti, e tosto fello
D'un drappo a oro bellissimo fornire,
E similmente ancor fece di quello
Il morto Arcita tutto rivestire,
E poi il fece a giacer porre in ello
Incoronato di fronde d'alloro,
Con ricco nastro rilegate d'oro.

Boccaccio was evidently drawing from observation, as may be seen by a reference to *ROMANIC REVIEW* 8. 223.

ALBERT STANBURROUGH COOK

YALE UNIVERSITY

HISPANIC NOTES

CAMISA; CEREZA.

Menéndez Pidal assumes, in his *Cantar de Mio Cid*, that *camisia* had long *i*. The Rumanian forms with *a* or *ea* for older *e* (**kaméša*), az in *masă* < *mensa*, *s(e)ară* < *sēra*, *vede* < **véade* < **védet* < *uidet*, show that the strest *i* was short. Latin *i* cood make Spanish strest *i* az a regular development: *tiña*, *tiñe*, *vía*. But Spanish *camisa* iz a loan-word, broht in with the thing itself by

¹ Ed. Camposampiero, Milan, 1819.

Catalan *mercaders*. Catalan has *dit* < *digitum*, with a direct chanje ov ôpen *i* to clôs *i* produced by contact with the folloing palatal (*Modern Philology*, XI, 351). Likewise the sound *š* produced clôs *i* from *ĩ*, hwær it waz developpt befoar *pira* became *péra*. Portugees *camisa*, contrery to *beijo* and *cereja*, waz perhaps taken from Spanish rather than directly from Catalan. The forenness ov Spanish *camisa* miht be cwestiond, if we call *cerveza* a loan-word from France; but it iz made fairly shure by the disagreement ov *camisa-dedo* with Catalan *camisa-dit* and Italian *camicia-dito*. French *chemise*, contrery to *cervoise*, iz evidently based on Provençial *camisa*. If Catalan *cervesa* and Provençial *cervesa* came from French *cerveise*, Catalan *camisa* and Provençial *camisa* may be nativ forms. But it iz not clear hwether Catalan *artemisa* and Provençial *artemisa* (beside French *armoise*) ar normal or bookish, so that the derivativs ov *camisia* in bôth langwejes may perhaps be loan-words from Italian.

Portugees *cereja* seems to agree with French *cerise* in calling for a basis with *è*. But Vianna tells us, in § 52 ov his *Pronuncia normal portuguesa*, that the simpl vouel *è* interchanjes with *ëi* befoar *j* (*ž*), *beijo* being sounded eether *bëižu* or *bëžu*. Thus the difference between *beijo* and *cereja* may be meerly dialectal, so that *cereja* cood hav come from *cerasea*. Galician has *beixo* (*beišu*) and *cereixa*, beside *vexo* = Portugees *veja* < *uideo*. Consonant-asimilation iz seen in Spanish *cereça* for **ceresa*, az in *cerveça* for **cervesa* and *cedaço* for **sedaço*.

E. H. TUTTLE

NORTH HAVEN, CONN.

EUSTORG DE BEAULIEU, A DISCIPLE OF MAROT

(Concluded from vol. VII, p. 109)

VII. THE *Chrestienne Resiouyssance* AND THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY SONG-BOOKS

IN the preceding chapter the process of turning popular songs into Protestant hymns was discussed in detail. In this chapter will be found a bibliographical table of Beaulieu's songs and their popular prototypes. M. Emile Picot, of the Institut de France, who has made an intensive study of sixteenth century songs, privately communicated to me the unpublished results of his investigations of the song-books as far as Beaulieu is concerned. It is with great pleasure that I thank him for his kindness. I have verified all of Prof. Picot's references that were available in the libraries of Paris and at the Musée Condé, Chantilly. In some cases I have been able to add to M. Picot's results, but those cases are very few.

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF CHANSONS

[In the following table all the Chansons contained in the *Chrestienne Resiouyssance* are listed alphabetically in roman type with the italicized title of the corresponding popular chanson paraphrased by Beaulieu, and accompanied in most cases by bibliographical indications. Where all indications are lacking, investigations have yielded no results.]

A Dieu la bonne chere (101).—*A Dieu la bonne chere.*

Allez fascheux, Caphardz, pleins de fallace (106).—*Allez fascheux, enuieux, plein d'audace.*

Amy Iesus: fay que ie t'ayme (75).—*Amy souffrez que ie vous ayme.*

1. Attaignant, Trente chansons musicales a quatre/parties nouvellement et trescorrectement imprimes a Paris par Pierre Attaignant demourant en la rue de la Harpe pres l'eglise saint Cosme, desquelles la table sensuyt. 1529, f. 10 v°, *Bibl. nat.* Vm7 171-183.

2. Sensuyuent/seize belles chansons nouvelles/dont les noms sensuyuent./Et

premierement/Aymez moy belle margot. (1521), 8vo, 8 fols., *Bibl. nat. Rés. Y.* 4457 (three stanzas of four verses).

3. Attaignant, Quarante et deux chansons, 1529, f. 6 v°. *Bibl. nat.*

4. Fleur des Chansons, n. d., n. pl., *Musée Condé*, Chantilly, No. 406, fol. A, 32.

A tout iamais d'un vouloir immuable (29).—*A tout iamais d'un vouloir immuable.*

1. A tout jamais d'un vouloir immortel. La serviray comme la plus notable. —, Du Chemin Un, deux, trois, 4 livres à 25 chansons à 4 parties. *Catal. Rothschild*. I: 627. Cf. Eitner II, 415. 1549, Book IV, vi. Music by Crequillon. 2. Attaignant, Vingt et neuf chansons musicales/a quatre parties imprimez a Paris par Pierre Attaignant libraire/demourant en la rue de la Harpe pres leglise saint Cosme Desquelles/la table sensuyt. 1530. *Bibl. Nat. Vm7* 171-183, chanson vi.

Après de Dieu maintenant ie demeure (31).—*Après de vous secrete-ment demeure.*

1. Chans. spirit. à l'honneur de Dieu, 1596, p. 281.

2. Attaignant, Trente et quatre Chansons musicales a quatre parties, Paris, Pierre Attaignant, janvier 1529, f. 2 v°. *Bibl. Nat.*

3. Ronsard, *Meslange*, 1572, f. 26 r°. Music by Alf. Tarabasco.

Au seul Dieu dira sa pensée (87).—*Las, à qui dira sa pensée*

La fille qui n'a point d'amy?

Aymé suis de l'amour fidelle (48).—*Le suis aymé de la plus belle.*

1. Marot, *Œuvres*, Jannet, II, p. 180, chanson 10.

Bon iour, bon an et bonne estreine (125).—*Bon iour, bon an et bonne estreine.*

1. Beaulieu, *Divers Rap.*, 1537, f. 65 v°.

2. The melody by Beaulieu is to be found in *Paragon des chansons*, contenant plusieurs nouvelles et delectables chansons que oncques ne furent imprimées au singulier prouffit et delectation des musiciens/Jacques Moderne (printed probably in 1538 or before, since the second volume bears that date), 4to, f. 5. (Cf. Becker, *E. de Beaulieu*, Paris, 1880).

Bons Chrestiens: fournissez la . . . (138).—Sung to the tune of: *Iehan fournier four cy four la.*

1. Bons chrestiens, tres tous ensemble Louer debrons le nom de Dieu. (6 couplets of 8 verses.)

Chanson nouvelle faicte sur les accordz entre le Roy et l'Empereur et se chante sur le chant: *Quand me souviens de la poulaille*. Sensuyt plu/sieurs belles chansons nouvelles, Im-/primees nouvellement, dont/les noms sensuyuent cy/apres en la table/Mil cinq cens xlii (1542)./On les vend a Paris en la rue/neufue nostre Dame a lenseigne/de lescu de France, small, 8vo, 42 unnumbered pages. *Bibl. Nat. Rés. Y.* 6117c. (Reprinted by A. Percheron, Geneva, J. Gay and Son, 1867, 16mo.)

Bourriquet, bourriquet
Es tu pas bien asne? (154).

*Bourriquet, bourriquet,
Harry, harry l'asne.*

1. Bourriquet, Bourriquet, Hanry Bourriquet l'ane: *Ancien Théâtre français*, published by Viollet-le-Duc and Anatole de Montaiglon, II, p. 373.
2. Bourriquet, bourriquet, Henry boury l'ane: *Le Fils et L'Examynateur*, in the *Joyeusetes*, published by Techener in the *Recueil des Farces*, 1837, vol. III.

3. Rabelais, Book I, chap. xi, mentions another song with the same refrain: Cen devant derriere, harry bourriquet.

To the same tune is sung:

a. Une teste rase Se vest de drapeaux (9 couplets of 8 verses). Chanson (contre la messe), sur le chant: Harry, harry, l'asne), Chansonnier huguenot, 1870, I, p. 145.

b. Chansons spirituelles à l'honneur de Dieu, 1596.

c. L'on sonne une cloche Dix ou douze coups. (15 coupl. of 8 verses.)

1°. Chanson nouvelle contenant la forme et manière de dire la messe: sur hari, hari, l'asne, 1562. Le Roux de Lincy, *Chants historiques*, 1841-42, II, 266.

2°. Chans Hug., I, 149.

Brunette ioliette
Qu'allez vous tant courir? (98).

*Brunette, ioliette,
Vous me faites mourir.*

1. Beaulieu's song reprinted in Chans. hug., I, 165.

C'en deuant derriere,
Changeons moeurs et tournons nous
C'en dessus dessoubz (158).

*C'en deuant derriere
Nous voulions passer les montz
C'en dessus dessoubz.*

1. This is probably the same song, referred to by Rabelais in Book I, chap. xi. (Cf. song no. 10.)

Cent mille escus en la courroye (111).—*Cent mille escus quand ie vouldroye.*

1. Cent mille escus quand je vouldroye
Et paradis quant je morroye,
Plus ne scavroie, souhaidier.

Bibl. James de Rothschild, *Recueil de chansons italiennes et françaises*, en forme de coeur, ms. sur vélin, 72 ff., end of the xvth century. (*Cat. Rothschild*, IV, p. 314, no. 2973, p. 315.) Cf. Montaiglon et Rothschild, 1878, XIII, p. 288.

Certes bon Iesus Christ (131).—*Und ueller uil hellenden, tag uuil hand der sol, uuol zu sant Iacob gont.*

(sur le chant d'une Allemande, que les pellerins de la belistrerie (ou ydolatrie) de S. Iaques: chantoyent iadis communement, par les portes.)

Ces fascheux sotz qui mauldissent Luther (70).—*Ces fascheux sotz qui mesdisent d'aymer.*

1. Ces fascheux sotz qui mesdient d'aymer,

Sans en avoir la congnoissance. . .

Fleur des Chansons, (1530?) Chantilly, f. A. 1, 3 couplets of 4 verses, reprinted in 1833, in *Joyeusetes*.

2. Sensuyvent plus. belles chansons, 1537 (Chantilly), f. lxx.

3. Attaignant, 42 chansons, f. 5 r°.

4. Ces fascheux sotz, qui medisent daymer

Et nen surent de leur vie la congnaissance. . .

Sensuyt plu-/sieurs belles chansons nouvelles et fort ioy-/euses. Auecques plusieurs autres retirees/des anciennes impressions, comme pourrez/veoir en la Table en laquelle sont comprin-/ses les premieres lignes des Chansons/1543/On les vend a Paris en la rue neufue/nostre Dame a lenseigne de lescu de/France, par Alain Lotrian, small, 8vo, *Bibl. Nat. Rés.*, Y 6117 = (2) f. lxx (incomplete).

C'est à grant tort que maint peuple murmure (71).—*C'est à grant tort que moy paouureté endure.*

1. Attaignant, 34 chansons, f. 15r°. *Bibl. Nat.*

2. In later collections, with melodies by Clemens non Papa in Ronsard, *Meslange*, 1572, f. 72r° (de Roy); and Josquin Baston (cf. Eitner, *Bibliographie der Musik-Sammelwerke*, pp. 471 and 401: 1549 k, 1560 d, 1570 d, 1597 h): song for 6 voices, 550 f. (Susato, f. 16.)

3. *Escorial Library*, Mo. 8vo, 24, fol. 13v°, Pierre Aubry, 1507.

4. It is cited in 1538 in *Le Disciple de Pantagruel*, otherwise known as *La Navigation du compaignon à la bouteille* (p. 39 of the 1867 reprint).

To the same tune are sung:

a. C'est a grand tort que moy, Messe, tant dure,

Et que je sois pour si bonne tenue.

Chansons spirit. à l'hon. de Dieu, 1596, p. 238.

b. Id. (11 couplets of 4 verses), *Chans. hug.*, I, pp. 134-136.

Cf. Picot, *Chants historiques français*, 1903, p. 149.

C'est assez dict, (ie vous entendz ma Dame) (114).—*C'est assez dict, ie vous entendz ma Dame.*

1. Eustorg de Beaulieu, *Divers Rapports*, 1537, f. 63v°.

C'est boucaner d'avoir femme plus d'une (69).—*C'est boucaner de ce tenir à une.*

1. Attaignant, 42 chansons, f. 5v°.

2. Fleur des Chansons (1530), f. 21 (3 coupl. of 4 verses).

3. Sensuyuent/VIII. belles chansons nouvelles dont les noms sensuiuent./Et premierement/Cest boucane de se tenir a une/Ma bien acquise ie suis venu icy/Le cueur est bien qui conques (sic) ne fut prins. . . (1521), 8vo, goth., *Bibl. Nat. Rés.*, Y. 4457 (3 coupl., 4 verses of 10 syl.); *Bibl. de Chantilly*, 407.

4. Sensuient/plusieurs belles Chansons nou/uelles et fort ioyeuses auec plu/sieurs autres retirees des an/ciennes impressions comme pourrez veoir a la table/en laquelle sont com-/prinse les premie/res lignes des/Chan-sons./Mil cinq cens xxxvii (1537)/On les vend a Paris en la rue neuf/ue Nostre Dame a lescu de France. 8vo, goth. *Catal. Chantilly*, 409.

To the same tune is sung:

C'est boucane den auoir plus dune.

Plus. belles ch., 1537, f. lxi.

C'est la Prestraille et Moynerie (153).—*Dictes que c'est du mal, m'amy.*

1. Plus. belles chansons, 1543, f. 32r°.

2. Chansons/nouvellement composees sur plusieurs/ chants, tant de Musique que Rus/tique: Nouuellement Impri-/mees: dont les noms sen/suyuent cy apres./Mil cinq cents xlviii (1548):/On les vend a Paris en la rue/Neufue Notre Dame a len-/seigne Saint Nicolas:/par Iehan Bon-/fons. 8vo, goth. f. no. 39, v° (reprinted in 1869).

3. Le/Recueil de toutes sor/ttes de Chansons/nouvelles, tant musicales que ru-/stiques, recueillies des plus/belles et plus facecieu-/ses qu'on a sceu/ choisir. . . . A Paris,/chez la veufue Nicolas Buffet, pres le College de Reims./1557, 16mo, f. 54r°. Municipal Library of Frankfort-am-Main and Imperial Library of Vienna.

4. Chans. huguenot, I, 169 (Beaulieu).

5. Picot, *Chants historiques fr.*, p. 153 (Beaulieu).

C'est tout pour vous (Dieu Magnifique) (122).—*C'est tout pour vous: Dame Musique.*

1. E. de Beaulieu, *Div. Rap.*, 1537, f. 62v°.

C'est une dure despartie (21).—*C'est une dure despartie*

De celle ou j'ai mis mon cuer.

1. S'ensuyuent plusieurs/belles Chansons nouvelles/Auec plusieurs aultres/ retirees des anciennes/impressions, comme/pourrez veoir a la/table en laquel/le sont les pre-/mieres lignes/des Chansons/et le feuillet/la ou se com/mencent les/dictes chan/sons/Mil cinq cens xxxv (1535). Cy finissent plusieurs chansons/nouvellement imprimees a/Paris. 8vo, goth., *Bibliothèque de Wolfenbüttel*, fol. xxiv.

2. (C'est une dure departie

De celuy où j'ay mis mon cuer)

Trente et une chansons musicales à 4 parties nouvellement imprimees, At-taignnant, Paris, 1529, fol. 10v°. Music by Claudin.

3. Plus. belles chansons nouvelles, Paris 1537, *Chantilly*.

4. Sensuyt plusieurs belles chansons nouvelles, Lotrian, 1543, fol. 10v°.

5. Ronsard, *Meslange*, 1572, music by Claudin le Jeune, fol. 71v°.

To the same tune are sung:

a. C'est une dure departie

Barthélemy Aneau, *Noel*, De l'ame et du corps forfaicteur. Chant

Natal contenant sept Noelz, ung chant Pastoural, et ung chant Royal, auec ung Mystere de la Natiuité, par personnages. . . . Seb. Gryphe, Lyons, 1539, small 4to, f. Br^o, *Bibl. Nat. Rés.* Ye, 782.

- b. A toy, Seigneur, sans cesse crie
Et du plus profond de mon coeur.

Psalm cxxx, (anonymous translation), *Psalmes de David*, 1541.
Cat. Rothsch., iv, no. 2736.

Changeons propos, c'est trop chanté d'amours (1).—*Changeons propos, c'est trop chanté d'amours.*

1. Marot, Jannet, II, 191.
2. Trente et sept chansons musicales/a quatre parties nouvellement et correstement reimprimees a Parsi/par Pierre Attaignant. . . . 1531, small 4to, Royal library of Munich, fol. 12, r^o, *Bibl. Nat. Rés.*, Vm⁷ 178.
3. Sensuyvent plus. belles ch., Paris, 1537, fol. xvi, *Chantilly*.
4. Sensuyt plusieurs belles chansons nouvelles, Lotrian, 1543, fol. 8.
5. Malingre, *Noëls nouveaux*, Neufchâtel, 1533, no. 20. Cf. *Chans. hug.*, II, p. 424.

To the same tune is sung:

- a. Changeons propos, c'est
trop chanté d'amours,
Ce sont clamours, chantons.

De la Fidelité Nuptiale par Gerard de Vivre, *Trois Comédies*, 1589,
p. 73, dix. 72.

Content desir, qui cause mon bon heur (32).—*Content desir, qui cause ma dolleur.*

1. Sensuivent plus. belles chansons, 1537 (by Marot), *Bibl. de Chantilly*.
2. Plus. belles chansons, 1543, fol. xxviii. (This folio is missing in the copy at the *Bibl. Nat.*)
3. Recueil de plus. chansons divisé en trois parties. Lyon, Rigaud et Sau-grain, 1557, 16mo, p. 32. It is cited in the *Dialogue Nouveau Fort Joyeux*, Picot et Nyrop, *Farces et Sotties*, 1880, p. 91.

To the same tune are sung:

- a. Content desir, qui cause tout bonheur. . . .
Aneau, *Noelz*, A, 4r^o.

- b. Content desir qui cause ma douleur.
Chans. spirit. à l'honneur de Dieu, 1596, p. 282.

Contre raison, toy Pape, es fort estrange (109).—*Contre raison vous, m'estes fort estrange.*

1. Attaignant, 34 chansons, fol. 10r^o.
2. S'ensuyent plus. belles chansons, Paris, 1537, *Chantilly*, f. xxxv.

D'amours ne me va au rebours (5).—*D'amours me ua tout au rebours.*

De bien aymer les Dames je ne blasme (6).—*De bien aymer les Dames ie ne blasme.*

De mon tres triste desplaisir (54).—*De mon tres triste desplaisir.*

1. Fleur des chansons, (1530 ?), f. 40.
2. Navigation du Compaignon à la Bouteille, p. 39 of the reprint.
3. Fleur des chansons, 1537, f. G. iii.
4. Eitner, 1540 a, Music by Berchem.
5. (De mon triste et desplaisir) Attaignant, 34 chans., f. 3v°.
6. Sensuyuent/seize belles chansons nouvelles/dont les noms sensuyuent/
Et premierement/Rymez moy belle margot . . . (1521), goth, 8vo, no. 13,
Bibl. Nat. Rés., Y. 4457.
7. Plus. belles chansons, Lotrian, 1543, f. lii.
8. Plus. belles chans., Viviant, no. 38.

To the same tune is sung:
Des assaulx que Satan me faict.

De retourner, Iesus Christ, ie te prie (25).—*De retourner mon amy ie te prie.*

1. Attaignant, 34 chansons, f. 12r°.
2. Recueil de plusieurs/Chansons diuisé/en trois parties en la première
sont les/chansons musicales: en la seconde les Chansons amoureuses &
rusti-/ques; & en la tierce les/chansons de la/guerre./Reueu & amplifié de
nouveau./A lyon./Par Benoist Rigaud & Ian Saugrain/1557. 16mo, 202 pp.,
Municipal library of Frankfort on the Main, Auct. Gall. Coll., 502, and Im-
perial and royal library of Vienna.

De retourner Iesus Christ ie te prie (25).—*De retourner mon amy ie te prie.*

1. Recueil et Eslite de plusieurs belles chansons joyeuses . . . colligées des
plus excellents poètes françois par J. W(alcourt); Anvers, chez Jean
Waesberge, 1576, 12mo, f. 93v°.
2. Attaignant, 34 chansons, f. 12r°.
3. Recueil, Rigaud et Saugrain, 1557, 29, no. 27.
4. Ronsard, *Meslange*, 1572, f. 58v°, music by Ad. Vuillard.

D'estre amoureux iamais ne seray las (4).—*D'estre amoureux iamais ie ne fus las.*

1. Attaignant, Trente et quatre chansons, f. 11v°.
2. Sensuyuent plus. belles chansons, 1537, f. 32.
3. Plus. belles chansons nouvelles, Lotrian, 1543, f. 32v°.

To the same tune is sung:
Charité est de Dieu le vrai lien.
Chans, spirit, à l'honneur de Dieu, 1596, p. 177.

De tant aymer mon coeur s'abuseroit (7).—*De tant aymer mon coeur s'abuseroit.*

1. Attaignant, Vingt neuf chansons, 1530, f. 9v°.

Dieu gard l'Escripture excellente (23).—*Dieu gard ma maistresse et regente.*

1. Marot, Jannet-Picard, II, p. 176.
2. Fleur des Chansons (Chantilly), 1537, no. 9.
Dieu gard de mon coeur la tres gente.
3. Recueil et Eslite, Waesberge, 1576, 260.

Dormoys tu?

Dormoys tu dy, grosse beste? (135).—*Te remues tu?*

Te remues tu gentil fillete?

(The song began: A Paris a troys fillettes.

Te remu tu gentil garsette?

1. Attaignant, Trente huyt Chansons musicales a quatre parties, Paris, 1529, 4to, f. 7. The music is by Jacques Godebrie, called Jacotin. (Cf. Eitner, *Bibl.*, p. 639.)
2. A Paris a trois fillettes
Gendarme, Alarme.
Ms. Utrecht Library, Varia, 202.
3. *Chans. hug.*, I, pp. 127 et seq. (Beaulieu.)
4. Picot, *Chants historiques fr.*, p. 153.

D'ou vient cella, monde d'abus remply (88).—*Dou vient celle, belle ie vous supply?*

1. Marot, Jannet, II, 182 (1525).
2. Plus. belles chans., Lotrian, 1543, f. xi r°.
3. Attaignant, 37 chans., 4.
4. S'ensuyuent plus. belles chans., 1537 (Chantilly), fol. xi.
5. Dou vient cela je vous supply.

Ms. Catal. Rothschild, I, p. 220, f. 3v° (No. 7).

D'un nouveau dard ie suis frappé (51).—*D'un nouveau dard ie suis frappé.*

1. (Second verse: Par auesin trop cruelle) Attaignant, Trente chansons musicales, 3v° (Tenor).
2. (Second verse: Par amour trop cruelle) Plus belles chansons, Lotrian, 1543, fol. 27r°.
3. (Second verse: Par Cupido, cruel de soy) Marot, II, 185 (1527).
4. Recueil et Eslite, Waesberge, 246v°.

En attendant le languir me tourmente (27).—*En attendant le languir me tourmente.*

(Not found as given by Beaulieu. The following begin with same two words:

1. En attendant d'amours la jouyssance,
Pour tout confort je n'en en esperance.

- Attaignant, Trente chansons musicales a quatre parties nouvellement et tres correctement imprimees a Paris, fol. 5v°.
2. (En attendant d'amours la jouissance
Mon bien m'amour et ma seulle fiance.)
A rondeau inserted by Heroyn de Lettenhove among the works attributed to Chastellain, 1863-66, Vol. VIII, p. 517.
 3. En attendant la vraye jouissance
De mon salut, j'ai eu en Dieu esperance.
Chans. spirit. à l'hon. de Dieu, 1596, p. 271.
 4. Picot, *Chants. histor.*, pp. 147, 148.
 5. Chans. hug., p. 347.

En contemplant la grande ydolatrie (59).—*En contemplant la beauté de m'ame.*

1. Cf. Eitner, 1549 n.

En entrant en un iardrin(sic) (78).—*En entrant en un iardin.*

1. En entrant en un jardin
Je trouvoy Guillot Martin.
Marot, II, p. 188.
2. (Second verse: J'ay trouvé Guillot Martin)
Attaignant, 31 chansons, f. 6v° (melody by Claudin).
3. En entrant en un jardin(et)
Je trouvoy Cuillot Martin
De la fidelité nuptiale, *Trois Comédies*, by Gerard de Vivre, 1589, p. 72 (7).

En esprit iusqu'au ciel ie vole (86).—*Le vais ie vien mon coeur s'en vole.*

1. Plus. belles chansons, 1543, xciii, v°.

En fait d'amours tu aimeras ton Dieu (2).—*En fait d'amours beau parler n'a plus lieu.*

1. (Second verse: Car sans argent vous parlez en ebrien). Rondeau by Jehan Marot, in Collerye, *Œuvres* (reprint), p. 190. Cf. Gasté, *Chansons normandes du xiv^e s.*, Caen, 1869, no. 78.

En recordant De coeur ardent (93).—*Ein ougenblik
Bringt oft das Gluk.*

Entre nous tous pellerins (120).—*Entre nous bons pelerins.*

(Chefs enclins,

Tenant de Dieu le partie. . .)

Dix setieme Livre de Chansons à 4 & 5 parties, Paris, Adr. Le Roy et Rob. Ballard, 1500, 8vo, fol. 6v°. Library of the *Institut de France*, Q. 645 A. Cf. *Catal. Rothschild*, I, 628. Cf. Eitner, p. 460.

Est il conclud par le conseil des lourdz (50).—*Est il conclud par un arrest d'amours.*

(Est-il conclus par ung arrest d'amours

Que désormais je vive en desespoir)

1. Fleur des Chans. (1528), *Chantilly*, no. 406, C, 4v°.

2. Fleur des Chansons (1530?), f. 16.

Et d'en bon iour (49).—*Et d'en bon iour*

Et d'ou venez vous?

1. (Second verse: Et dont venez vous?)

Attaignant, *Trente chansons*, 1529, f. 6v°. (Eitner, p. 318.)

Faict ou failly ou du tout rien qui vaille (68).—*Faict ou failly, ou du tout rien qui vaille.*

1. Plus. belles chans., 1537, f. 30.

2. Attaignant, 30 Chans., f. 14v°. *Bibl. Nat.*

3. Melody by Bridam. Cf. Eitner, 1533a.

4. Plus. belles chansons, Lotrian, 1543, f. 30v°.

Faulte de foy, c'est erreur non pareille (91).—*Faulte d'argent c'est dolleur non pareille.*

1. Plus. belles chans., 1537, f. lxxxvi.

2. Beaulieu's song was published in 1533 in *Noels nouveaux*, publ. by Mathieu Malingre at Neuchâtel. Cf. *Chans. hug.*, II, p. 42 et seq.

3. Cf. also Pierre Fabri, *Le grand et vray Art de pleine rhétorique*, ed. by Héron, 1890, II, p. 85.

4. Rabelais, Book II, chap. XVI, mentions the song.

5. *Farce joyeuse du savetier*, Le Roux de Lincy et Michel, *Recueil de Farces*, 1837, iv, no. 73, p. 5.

6. Ballad in the *Amoureux Passetemps*, Lyons, Rigaud, 1582, f. E, 5.

7. Roger de Collerye (Ch. d'Héricault edition, p. 223) composed to the same refrain a rondeau which was in part reproduced by M. Gonin. (Fournier, *Variétés hist. et litt.*, V, p. 223.)

8. Ronsard, *Meslange*, 1572, f. 32v°, Melody by Josquin, fol. 53v°. Also with a melody by Ad. Vuillard.

9. Fleur des Chansons à trois parties, Louvain, Pierre Phalèse, and Antwerp, Jean Bellère. 1574.

Femme qui tant souvent babille (67).—*Femme qui tant souvent babille.*

Fortune ne donne à nul vie (66).—*Fortune, laisse moy la vie.*

1. Plus. belles chansons, 1537, f. lv.

2. Plus. belles chans., 1543, f. lx.

3. Chansons nouvelles, Vve Buffet, II and III, 1559, f. 47r°, no. 40.

4. (Second verse: Puis que tu veulx avoir les biens.)

Attaignant, 42 chansons, f. 6v°.

5. (Second verse: Puisque tu as prins tous mes biens) (3 couplets of 4

verses). Fleur des Chansons (1530?), 19. The melody, written by Rousée, is found in the *Meslange* of 1572, f. 9, but the words are different (the second verse is: Tu me tourmente rudement).

6. Cf. Eitner, p. 320. Rhaw, no. 90.

7. (Second verse: *Puis que tu mas oste les biens.*) (Version imitated by Beaulieu.)

Fy de Venus et de son passetemps (105).—*Fy de Venus et de son passetemps.*

1. Cf. Beaulieu, *Divers Rapportz*, ch. vi.

Gris ne bureau ne fault porter (15).—*Gris et taré me fault porter.*

1. Gris et tenné me fault porter.

Attaignant, 29 chansons, Tenor, f. 5v°.

2. Attaignant, Trente huyt Chansons musicales a quatre parties, 1529, 4to, f. 5v°, melody by Gombert.

3. Ronsard, *Meslange*, 1572, f. 52 (mel. by Leschenet), taken from the song: En plains et pleurs je prends congé, G. Paris, *Chansons du xiv^e siècle*, 1875.

4. Chans. hug., I, 173-174. (Beaulieu.)

Hellas Iesus mon Redempteur (52).—*Hellas que vous a fait mon coeur.*

(Second verse: Ma dame, que le hayez tant)

1. Plusieurs belles chansons nouvelles, 1535, no. 20.

2. Plusieurs belles chansons nouvelles, 1543, fol. 19v°.

3. Recueil de plusieurs chansons, Rigaud et Saugrain, 1557, p. 75.

4. La Fleur des chansons, 1580, no. 39.

5. The same song is to be found, with the melody by Locquenez, in Le Recueil des plus belles et excellentes chansons en forme de voix de ville, Jean Chardavoine, 1588, f. 222.

6. As early as 1520 Antoine de Arena cites the air: *Helas! que vous a fait mon coeur* as a "basse danse a 19." (Cf. Brunet.)

7. (Second verse: Madame qui le gardez tant.) Plus. belles chansons, 1543, f. 1.

8. Ibid. Sensuyt plu-/sieurs belles chansons nouvelles, 1542, no. 41, f. Lij v° (p. 73 of the reprint of 1867, by Percheron, Geneva, 16mo).

To the same tune are sung:

a. A Dieu, ma dame par amours,

Sans oublier le temps passé.

1°. Chans. nouv. composées, 1548, no. 39.

2°. Recueil, Rigaud et Saugrain, 1557, p. 117.

3°. Le Recueil de toutes sortes de chans., Paris, Buffet, 1557, fo. 43v°.

b. François, Espagnols et Flamands.

c. Pauvre pecheur, vil entaché.

d. Peuple, par dure affection.

Montaignon et Rothschild, *Recueil*, X, p. 58. (Cf. Picot, *Chants hist.*, p. 111.)

Hellas que i'auray d'ennuy (157).—*Hellas que i'auray d'ennuy,
Si le temps que ie uoy me dure,
dure.*

Il est huy bon iour de feste (150).—*Il est iour dict l'alouette.*

1. Attaignant, 37 chans., f. 6.

Il est certain que Dieu de là sus (146).—*Il m'est aduis que les
amoureux.*

Il me souffit de tous mes maux (53).—*Il me souffit de tous mes maux.*

1. Attaignant, 34 chans., f. 16v°.

2. Plus. belles chans., Lotrian, 1543, f. lxxiii.

To the same tune is sung:

O combien sont jolis et beaux. (Cf. Eitner.)

J'ai contenté

J'ai contenté

Ma volonté

Ma volonté.

Souffisamment (49).

1. Attaignant, 37 chansons, f. 15v°.

2. Marot, II, 183 (1525).

3. Plus. belles chans., 1535, no. xxvii.

4. S'ensuyvent plus. belles chans., 1537 (Chantilly), f. xviii.

5. Plus. belles chans., Lotrian, 1543, f. 23r°.

6. Recueil et Eslite, 286v°.

7. Ronsard, *Meslange*, 1572, f. 65r°. (Melody by Nicolas.)

J'ai demouré seulle esgarée (65).—*J'ai demouré seulle esgarée.*

1. La fleur des chansons, Chantilly (1530 ?), no. 11. (Ie demeure seulle.)

J'ai faict en vain cent mille pas (36).—*J'ai faict pour vous cent mille
pas.*

1. Chansons spirit. à l'honneur de Dieu, 1596, p. 285.

J'aime le coeur de Marie (10).—*J'aime le coeur de m'amie.*

1. Marot, II, 190 (1527).

2. Attaignant, Trente six chansons, 1530, f. 4r°. Melody by Claudin. (Cf. Eitner, no. 1535b.)

3. Recueil et Eslite, 1576, 245v°.

4. Chansons nouvelles, Vve. Buffet, 1557, II and III, f. 20v°, no. 16, bis.

J'ai trop chanté l'abominable messe (35).—*J'ai trop aimé, vraiment je
le confesse.*

1. (Second verse: A ce me passe et quitte le mestier.)

Attaignant, 42 chans., f. 7r°.

2. (Second verse: A tant j'en quitte marchandise et mestier.)

Attaignant, Trente chans., f. 13v°. (Cf. Eitner, p. 329.)

There is another song, beginning: J'ai trop aimé le temps de ma jeunesse.
It does not seem to be the one imitated by Beaulieu.)

J'ai un mari qui m'exhorte (97).—*J'ai un Cyron sur la mothe.*

1. Plus. belles chansons, 1535, no. xi.
2. Op. cit., 17 couplets nouvellement composés, no. 60.
3. S'ensuyvent plus. belles chans., 1537 (Chantilly), f. xii.
4. Plus. belles chans., Lotrian, 1543, f. 12r°.
5. Chansons nouvelles, Vve. Buffet, 1557, f. 54v°.
6. Recueil, Rigaud et Saugrain, 1557, p. 125, no. 86.

Jamais n'aymeray pardon (159).—*Jamais n'aymeray maçon.*

Cf. Eitner p. 155, (1559b).

J'attendz secours de ma seulle pensée (22).—*J'attendz secours de ma seulle pensée.*

1. Marot, ed. Jannet-Picard, II, 177 (1525).
2. Attaignant, 37 Chansons, f. 12v°.
3. Recueil et Eslite, 1576, 73v°.
4. S'ensuyvent plus. belles chans., 1537 (Chantilly), xliii.
5. Plus. belles chans., Lotrian, 1543, f. xliii.

To the same tune is sung:

Le juste ira haut au saint tabernacle.

Je me plaintz fort. Satan m'a rué ius (43).—*Je me plainctz fort, amours m'ont rué jus.*

1. Fleur des chans. (1528), 31.
2. Sensuyuent/seize belles chansons nouvelles/done les noms sensuyuent/
Et premierement/Aymez moy belle margot, (1521), goth., 8vo, *Bibl. Nat. Rés.*, Y. 4457, no. 14.
3. Sensuyuent dixsept belles Chansons nouvelles dont les noms sensuyuent,
goth., reprinted by Durand brothers at Chartres in 1874, no. 6.
4. (Je m'y plein fort qu'Amours m'ont rué jus.)
Ronsard, *Meslange*, 1572, f. 59r°. Canon in dyatessarium. Music by
Leschenet.
5. Je ne plains fort qu'on me vueille ruer jus. 2 couplets, 1525. Cf. Chans.
hug., I, pp. xviii et seq.
6. Beaulieu's song in: Chans. spirit. à l'hon. de Dieu, 1596, p. 287.

Je n'ay desir

J'ay grand desir

De plus choisir (13).

D'avoir plaisir.

1. Marot, II, 189 (1525).
2. Recueil et Eslite, 1576, 261r°.
3. Attaignant, 36 chansons, f. 12r°.
4. Attaignant, 38 chansons, f. 12r°. (Eitner, p. 19.)

Je n'avois pas à bien choisir failly (60).—*Je n'avois pas à bien choisir failly.*

Je ne fais rien que requérir (50).—*Je ne fais rien que requérir.*

1. Attaignant, 30 chans., Tenor, f. 2r°.

2. Marot, II, 184.
3. Ronsard, *Meslange*, 1572, f. 47r°, melody by Wildre.
4. Recueil et Eslite, 1596, 210r°.

Je ne me puis tenir (61).—*Je ne me puis tenir pour chose que lon die.*

1. Plus. belles chans., 1535, f. 36v°.
2. Chansons nouvellement assemblees/outre les anciennes/Lmpressions./ MDXXXVIII (1538), 16mo, Royal Library of Stuttgart.
3. Plus. belles chans., 1543, f. 1. (Eitner, p. 3; 1503a.)

Je ne scay pas comment (90).—*Je ne scap pas comment.*

1. (2d verse) *A mon entendement.*
Attaignant, 42 chans., f. 5 v°.
2. Ancien Théâtre fr., II, p. 150.
3. Plus. belles chans., 1537 (Chantilly), f. xl v°.
4. Plus. belles chans., 1543, f. xliii v°.
5. La fleur des chansons/Les grans chansons nouuelles/qui sont au nombre Cent et dix/ou est comprise la chanson du Roy/la chanson que/le roy fist en espaigne, la chanson de Rome/la chanson des Brunettes et Teremutu et/plusieurs aultres nouvelles chansons les quel/les trouueres par la table ensuyuant . . . Paris, about 1530, small 8vo, 32 folios, Library of the Château of Chantilly, no. 406. (Reprinted in the *Joyesetez*, published by Techenner in 1837. Cf. Brunet.)
6. Ronsard, *Meslange de Chansons*, tant des vieux auteurs que des modernes, a ung, six, sept et huict parties, 1572, f. 76r°, music by Wildre, *Bibl. Nat. Rés.*, p. Ye, 123.

To the same tune are sung:

- a. Pecheurs, souffrez que Dieu vous ayme.
Noelz nou/veaux, et deuots Can-/tiques à l'honneur de nostre Seigneur Iesus Christ, faictz/& composez par Christophle de Bordeaux/ Parisien, pour l'année mil cinq cens quatre/vingts/& un./A Paris/ Par Nicolas Bonfons. . . f. 54v°. Cf. *Cat. Rothschild*, IV, p. 340.
- b. Si vous craignez de Dieu la traine.
Chansons/spiritueles/à l'honneur de Dieu, & à l'edifi/cation du prochain./Reueues & corrigées de nou-/ueau: avec une Table/mise à la fin./M.D.XCVI (1596)/Pour la vefue de Iean Durant. (Geneva), 16mo, 439 pp., *Bibl. Chantilly*, C3t, vol. II, no. 1371, p. 184.
- c. L'amour de moy (si est enclose):
De ceste abysme tant profonde
A toy je crie, mon Seigneur.
Psalmes de David, 1541. (*Cat. Rothschild*, IV, no. 2736.)

Je ne scay comment ie pourrois avoir marrisson (143).—*Je ne scay comment il pourrois avoir marrisson.*

Je te feray misericorde (148).—*Io te faro portar le corne.* (Ital.)

Jouyssance vous donneray (62).—*Jouyssance vous donneray.*

1. (2d verse: Mon amy, et si meneray.)
Marot, II, p. 177 (1525).
2. Plus. belles chans., 1537 (Chantilly), f. xl.
3. Plus. belles chans., 1543, f. xl.
4. (Mon amy, et vous meneray)
Attaignant, 37 chans., f. 5 r°.
5. Ronsard, *Meslange*, 1572, f. 1 r°. Melody by Vuillart.

L'amitié fut bien commencée (73).—*L'amitié fut bien commencée.*

L'Amour de Dieu me point (74).—*Amour au cueur me point.*

1. Marot, ed. Jannet-Picard, II, 186 (1524).
2. Sensuiuent/plusieurs belles Chansons nou/uelles et fort ioyeuses avec plu/sieurs autres retirees des an/ciennes impressions comme pourrez veoir a la table/en laquelle sont com-/prinses les premie/res lignes des/Chansons./Mil cinq cens xxxvii (1537)./On les vend a Paris en la rue neuf/ue Nostre Dame a lescu de France. Finis. goth, 8vo. *Musée Condé, Chantilly*, VI, E, 43.
3. Sensuyt plusieurs belles chansons nouuelles, 1543, f. 25 v°.
4. (Clemens non papa à huit.) Ronsard, *Meslange*, 1572, f. 76 v°, 77 r°.
5. Recueil et Eslite de plusieurs belles chansons joyeuses . . . colliges des plus excellents poètes françois par J. W(aesberge); Anvers, chez Jean Waesberge, 1576, 12mo, fol. 16.

Languir me fait la reigle mal dressée (38).—*Languir me fais sans l'auoir offensée.*

1. Marot, II, p. 182.
2. Attaignant, 37 chans., f. 13 r°.
3. Plus. belles chans., 1543, f. xxxvii.
4. Manuscript, *Catalogue Rothschild*, f. 2 (no. 4), p. 220.
5. (Beaulieu's song) Chans. spirit. à l'hon. de Dieu, 1596.
6. Recueil et Eslite, 1576, 73 v°.
7. Cf. Eitner, 1559, melody by Josquin Baston; also p. 331.
8. Cf. Picot et Nyrop, *Nouveau Recueil de Farces fr., du xv^e et du xvii^e s.*, 1881, p. 91. The song is cited in the *Dialogue Nouveau fort joyeux*.

To the same tune are sung:

- a. Languir me fait la regle maldressée.
- b. Le vieil serpent par venimeux sibile.

La rosée au moys de May (125).—*La rosée du moys de May.*

1. Ronsard, *Meslange*, 1572, melody by Mouton, f. 86.
 2. *Op. cit.*, by Rousée, f. 63 v°.
 3. *Op. cit.*, melody by Moulu, 63 v°.
- (Another song, beginning with the same verse is to be found in Attaignant, 36 chans., and in another collection, but the second verse proves that it is not the one imitated by Beaulieu.)

Las ie me plains, maulgré de la pecune (16).—*Las ie me plains, mauldicte soit fortune.*

1. Attaignant, 36 chansons, f. 16 r°.

Las, voulez-vous qu'une personne chante (34).—*Las voulez vous qu'une personne chante.*

1. (2d verse: A qui te ne fait que souspirer.)
Attaignant, 37 chans., f. 8 v°. (Eitner, p. 332.)
2. (2d verse: A qui le coeur ne fait que souspirer.)
Manuscript, Rothschild Library, Cat., I, p. 225, art. 73. (Melody by
by Orlande de Lassus.)
3. Ronsard, *Meslange*, 1572, f. 206, melody by Nicolas Gombert. (Cf. Eitner, p. 500.)
4. Dousiesme Livre de Chansons à quatre et cinq parties, Paris, Adr. Le Roy et Rob. Ballard, 1572, 8vo, f. 1 v°. Library of the Institut, Q. 645 A. (Not in Eitner.)
5. Chans. spirit. à l'hon. de Dieu, 1596, p. 283. (Beaulieu.)
6. Cf. Chans. hug., I, pp. lxxxi et seq. (Beaulieu.)

Laudate dominum, mes amis (160).—*Laudate dominum, mes amys, Laudate dominum de coelis.*

L'aulture iour m'alloye esbatre (127).—*L'aulture iour m'alloye esbatre.*

1. Attaignant, 29 chans., f. xiii. (Eitner, p. 532.)

Le coeur est bon et le vouloir aussi (55).—*Le coeur est bon et le vouloir aussi.*

1. Attaignant, 37 chans., f. 13 r°. (Eitner, p. 333.)

Le coeur est mien qui oncques ne fut prins (42).—*Le coeur est mien qui oncques ne fut prins.*

1. Attaignant, 42 chans., f. 4 v°.
2. Fleur des chans. (1530 ?), f. 15. (Chantilly.)
3. Sensuyvent plus. belles chans., 1537 (Chantilly), f. lix.
4. Huit belles chans., nouv. (1521). *Bibl. Nat. Rés.*, Y. 4457, no. 3.
5. Ronsard, *Meslange*, 1572, f. 61 v°. Melody by Leschenet (canon in subdyapason).
6. Chans. spirit. à l'hon. de Dieu, p. 286. (Beaulieu.)

Le content est riche en ce monde (17).—*Le content est riche en ce monde.*

1. Attaignant, 37 chans., f. 6 v°. (Cf. Eitner, p. 854.) Melody by Claudin de Sermisy.
2. Primo libro de la canzonni francese, Venezia, Octavianus Scotus, 1535, 8vo, no. 6. (Eitner, pp. 34, 333.)

Le iaulne et bleu sont les colleurs (14).—*Le iaulne et bleu sont les colleurs.*

1. Attaignant, 35 chans., f. 11 v°. (Eitner, p. 333.)
2. Sensuyvent plus. belles chans., 1537 (Chantilly), fol. xliii.
3. Plus. belles chans., 1543, f. xliii.

Le Saint Esprit mon paouure coeur desire (36).—*Le coeur de nous ma presence desire.*

1. Trente et une chansons musicales (Attaignant), fol. 2. (Eitner, p. 333.)
2. Le Paragon des Chansons, 1530, f. 28.

Les enuieux par leur propos nuysans (108).—*Les enuieux ne leurs motz cuisans.*

(Melody by Beaulieu) *Div. Rap.*, 1537, f. 63 v°.

Les Moynes n'ont plus que faire (82).—*Mon amy n'a plus que faire.*

Le temps n'est plus tel comme il souloit estre (102).—*Le temps n'est plus comme il souloit estre.*

(Melody by Beaulieu) *Div. Rap.*, 1537, f. 65 r°.

Longtemps y a que ie vy en espoir (24).—*Longtemps y a que ie vy en espoir.*

1. Marot, II, p. 187.
2. Attaignant, 35 chansons, f. 8 v°.
3. Plus. belles chans., 1535, no. 28.
4. Plus. belles chans., 1543, f. 23 v°.
5. Attaignant, 36 chansons, f. 13 v°.
6. Rigaud et Saugrain, Recueil, 1557, f. 24, no. 18.
7. Recueil et Eslite, 1576, 93 v°.
8. Le Recueil des plus. belles et excellentes chansons en forme de voix de ville, Paris, 1588. Marc Locqueneur, published by Jean de Chardavoine, f. 108 v°. (With music.)
9. Chans. hug., vol. I, p. 104. (Beaulieu.)

Maint grand assault la chair si me donna (8).—*Un grand plaisir Cupido me donna.*

1. Attaignant, 35 chansons, 1529, f. 4 r°.
2. Plus. belles chans., 1535, no. xxv.
3. Plus. belles chans., 1543, f. 22 v°.
4. Rigaud et Saugrain, Recueil, 1557, p. 23, no. 17.
5. Chardavoine, Recueil, 1588, 106 v°.

Martin Luther a esté bien fasché (123).—*Martin menoit son porceau au marché.*

(This is epigram no. 32 by Marot.)

1. Plus. belles chans., 1535, no. 5.

2. Attaignant, *Trente et une chans.*, 1534, with melody by Alaire. Cf. Eitner, 1534.

3. Manuscript, *Cat. Rothschild*, IV, no. 2945 (f. 39).

Mauldicte soit la mondaine finesse (18).—*Mauldicte soit la mondaine richesse.*

1. Marot, II, 135.

2. Recueil et Esliste, 1576, 93 r°.

3. Second verse: Qui m'a osté ma dame (instead of m'amy) et ma maistresse.

Attaignant, 31 chans., f. 8 v°, melody by Claudin.

Mauldict soit le faulx chrestien (85).—*Mauldict soit le petit chien.*

1. Farce du joyeux savetier, Techener, IV.

2. Farce d'un vendeur de livres, *op. cit.*, II, p. 14.

3. Ancien théâtre français, II, p. 54, *La Farce de Calbain*.

To the same tune is sung:

En Provenso ha uno villo.

(The text bears the phrase: Baudisso, le petit chien.) Cf. *Chansons nouvelles en lengaige prouensal*, reprinted by Emile Picot, 1909, p. 42.

Maulgré Satan (le Prince des Iniques) (141).—*Sur le chant des Allemandes communes (qu'on appelle) comme on les ioue en France, sur les instrumens de musique.*

Mon Createur ayez de moy mercy (79).—*Ma chere Dame, ayez de moy mercy.*

Mondain seiour i'ay perdu ta presence (103).—*Mondain seiour i'ay perdu ta presence.*

1. *Div. rap.*, 1535, f. 64 r°. (Eitner, 1538 m.)

2. Paragon des chansons, Second Livre, 1538, f. 15. (Transcribed by Becker in his article on Beaulieu. Cf. Appendix.)

Mon Dieu ne m'a son filz vendu (19).—*Madame ne m'a pas uendu.*

1. Marot, ed. 1702, I, p. 306.

2. Attaignant, 35 chans., f. 3.

3. Recueil et Esliste, 1576, 210 v°.

Mon pere m'a donné son filz (80).—*Mon pere m'a donné mary.*

1. Balade en chronison, Jardin de Plaisance, Lyons, Arnoullet, n. d. (1525), f. 55 c. Cf. *Cat. Rothschild*, IV, 104.

2. To the same tune is sung: Venus a toy je me plains: G. Alione, *Opera iocunda metro macharronico materno et gallico composita*, 1521, reprinted in 1865, p. 116.

(Eitner, p. 338.)

Mort ou mercy en ce monde i'attendz (39).—*Mort ou mercy en languissant i'attendz.*

1°. Recueil de poésies du XVI^e Siècle. Ms. in 4°. *Cat. Rothschild*, IV, p. 288

Mourir convient *Morir conuient*
 Souuent aduient (118). *Souuent aduient.*

(Melody by Beaulieu.)

N'aurez vous pas de moy pitié (64).—*N'aurez vous pas de moy pitié?*

N'aymez iamais ces Caphardz lourdz (84).—*N'aymez iamais ces gens de court.*

1. Cf. Eitner, p. 339.

N'aymez iamais la loy humayne (83).—*N'aymez iamais une uilayne.*

Nous auons faict grand feste (145).—*Nous uieinsmes à al feste.*

Nous seruiron le Roy (96).—*Nous seruiron le Roy.*

O Dieu, prens moy à mercy (132).—*Miserere mei: Diu.*

(So many songs begin with the same verse that it is impossible to trace it.)

O grand beaulté qui loges cruauté (20).—*O cruaulté logée en grand beaulté.*

1. Marot, Jannet-Picard, II, p. 189.

2. Attaignant, Trente et sept chansons, 1532, f. 3 v°, with melody by Sermsy.

3. Cinquiesme Livre contenant xxv chansons, Paris, Attaignant and Jullet, 1540, f. 14. Cf. Eitner, *Bibliographie*, pp. 855 and 645. Cf. also Picot, *Chants historiques*, p. 146.

O Hermitte chattemite (130).—*O Hermitte saint Hermite.*

(Melody by Beaulieu.)

To the same tune are sung:

a. Gardez vous des faulx prophetes.

b. Chantons trestous a ce Noël, O Noël.

On dict que c'est un grand sollas (116).—*On dict que c'est un grand sollas.*

(Melody by Beaulieu.)

1. Cf. *Divers Rapports*, 1537, Chanson iv.

Or vien ça vien: toy Pape et ta secte (144).—*Or vien ça uien, m'amyte Perrette.*

O saint Esprit, vien enflammer noz coeurs (57).—*Allez souspirs, enflammez au froigt cœur.*

1. Attaignant, 29 chans., 1530, f. 10 v°.

O seul vray Dieu (qui point ne mens) (95).—*Les Bourguignons meirent le camp, devant la ville de Peronne.*

1. Cf. Eitner, 666. Music by Fr. de Layolle, 1538.

To the same tune are sung:

- a. La veille de la saint Martin (1567).
- b. Le mardi devant le Toussaint (1552).
- c. Quand j'ay bien à mon cas pensé (1590).
- d. Resjouissez vous laboureurs.
- e. Dieu gard de mal le roy François.

(Cf. Picot, *Chants historiques*, p. 162.)

O vray Dieu nostre bon Pere (147).—*Piscatore* (Italian).

Paix là, sus ho là: paix là (133).—*Paix là, sus ho là: paix là.*

Par ton regard tu voidz ciel, terre et mer (28).—*Par ton regard tu me fais esperer.*

1. Attaignant, 36 chans., 1530, f. 3 r°. Melody by Claudin.
2. (Par ton regard tu m'y fais esperer.)
Plus. belles chans. (1535), no. viii.
3. S'ensuyvent plus. belles chansons, 1537, f. xl.
4. Chans., nouv., Lotrian, 1543, f. 11 r°.
5. Chans. hug., II, p. 441, mentions a volume entitled: Cinquante pseumes de David, translated by Marot, Paris, Bogard, 1545, in which is to be found a song with the same first verse. (no. 7.)
6. Chans., nouv., Rigaud et Saugrain, 1557, p. 22, no. 15.
7. Recueil et Eslite, 1576, 93 v°.
8. Chans, spirit. à l'honneur de Dieu, p. 145.
9. (Par ton Regard tu me faitz esperer
En mon salut, Vierge qui procurer.)
Noël sur la chanson que se chante: Par ton regard, Noëlz, Bonfons, fol. 10 v. (*Rothsch. Cat.*, IV, 340.)
10. Par ton regard tu me fais espérer,
En espérant me convient endurer.
Cf. Bordier, *Chans. hug.*, I, p. 36. (Beaulieu.)

Plaisant Bordeaux, noble et Royal domaine (112).—*Plaisant Bordeaux, noble et Royal domaine.*

Beaulieu, *Divers Rapports*, chans. ix.

Plaisir n'ay plus fors quand pense à la mort (41).—*Plaisir n'ay plus, mais uy en desconfort.*

1. Attaignant, 36 chansons, 1530, f. 5 v°.
2. Attaignant, 32 chansons, 1530, f. 16.
3. Marot, Jannet, II, p. 175.
4. (Plaisir n'ay plus que vivre en desconfort,
Confortez vous gens de noble valleur.)

Signed: Grace et Amour. Jo. Daniellus, organista, Noëlz, Bonfons, Chardon, No. V, p. 13.

5. (Plaisir n'ay plus mais vi en desconfort;
Fortune m'a remis en grand douleur.)
Recueil et Eslite, 1576, 12mo, fol. 67 v°.

Pour auoir faict au gré de l'ennemy (44).—*Pour auoir faict au gré de mon amy.*

1. Plus. belles chansons, 1521 Viviant, no. 19.
2. Fleur des Chansons (1530 ?), 6.
3. (Second verse: Esse raison d'en estre diffamée?)
Gasté, *Chansons normandes*, 1869, no. 36.
4. Basse danse à 24. Antoine de Arena transcribed a notation for this danse. (Cf. Brunet.) It was a popular danse at the time.
5. Plus. belles chans., Lotrian, 1543, f. B1.

Prisonnier suis pour l'Euangile (92).—*M'amy m'a cousté cent liures.*

Preschez leur rien qui vaille (100).—*Touchez nous l'Antiquaille,
Et nous la danserons.*

1. Cf. Navigation du Compaignon à la bouteille, 1538, p. 40 of the reprint, Jannet edition, II, p. 117. Rabelais refers to it.
2. Chans. hug., I, 124-126. (Beaulieu.)

To the same tune is sung:

Le Pape et les sieurs tous.

Chans. hug., I, p. 129. Cf. Picot, *Chants historiques*, p. 149.

Puis qu'en amours a si beau passetemps (3).—*Puis qu'en amours a si beau passetemps.*

1. Fleur des chansons (1530 ?), 18.
2. (Second verse: Puisqu'en amours a si grant passé (temps)
Je vueil aymer, dancer et rire.)
Attaignant, 31 chans., f. 14 r°. Music by Claudin.
3. Plus. belles chans., 1543, f. xxxiv.
4. Sensuyent plus. ch. belles, 1537, f. xxxix.
5. Chans. hug., I, 32. (Beaulieu.)

To the same tune is sung: Du bon cueur chantons en ce saint temps.

Noelz nouveaux, Bonfons, f. 43 v°. (Cat. Rothsch., IV, p. 340.)

Puis que t'en uas (paouure Loy Papistique) (107).—*Puis que t'en uas: ne scay ou ie m'applique.*

1. Beaulieu, *Divers Rapports*, Chans., viii.

Quand i'ay pensé en vous Bible sacrée (46).—*Quand i'ay pensé en vous ma bien amyée.*

1. Attaignant, 38 chans., xiii r°.
2. Marot, II, 179.
3. Chansons spirit. à l'honneur de Dieu, 1596, p. 288.

Quand j'estois en ma jeunesse (156).—*Sansonnet, Buissonnet, Las que devint mon cotillonnet.*

Quand tu voudras ton courage renger (110).—*Quand tu uouldras ton humble serf renger.*

Quand vous voudrez faire une amye (12).—*Quand vous voudrez faire une amye.*

1. Marot, II, 187 (1527).
2. Recueil et Eslite, 1576, 282 v°.
3. Attaingnant, 38 chansons, f. xi v°.
4. Chans. hug., I, p. 33. (Beaulieu.)

Qui la dira la peine de mon cœur (81).—*Qui la dira la peine de mon cœur*

Et la douleur que pour mon amy porte.

1. Ronsard, *Meslange*, 1572, f. 83 v° and 85. *Canon à l'unison à huit*, music by Verdelot.
2. The same, music by Ad. Vuillart, f. 2 r°.
3. (Second verse: *Et la langueur que pour son amy porte.*)
Song cited by Noël du Fail, *Propos rustiques*, 1547, No. IV, La Borderie, f. 33. Cf. also p. 249. Cf. Eitner, p. 16; p. 349.
4. Sensuyuent viii belles chansons nouvelles (1521), goth. 4 fols., *Bibl. Nat. Rés.* Y. 4457.
5. *Fleur des Chansons* (1530 ?), 28.
6. Seize belles chansons nouvelles, No. 3. *Bibl. Nat. Rés.* Y. 4457. (In second verse we read *son amy*).
To the same tune are sung:
 - a. Qui la dira, la douleur de mon cœur
Et le souci que pour mon peché porte.

Qui la voudra, la Messe, si l'endure (37).—*Qui la voudra, souhaite que ie meurs.*

Cf. Eitner, p. 143.

- a. Chans, spirit. à l'honneur de Dieu, 1596, p. 111.
- b. Qui chantera Noël du bon du cœur.

Qui veult auoir liesse (47).—*Qui veult auoir liesse.*

1. Marot, II, 181 (1524).
2. Plus. belles chans., 1543, f. lxxxii.
3. Recueil et Eslite, 23 v°.
4. Rigaud et Saugrain, 1557, 80, no. 62.
5. (Second verse: *Et avecques Dieu part*; sung to the tune of: *Monsieur de Bourbon*.)
Plus. belles chans. nouvelles, 1542, no. 36.

6. Ibid., Chansons/nouvellement composees sur plusieurs/chants, tant de Musique que Rus/tique: Nouuellement Impri-/mees: dont les noms sen/suyuent cy apres./Mil cinq cents xlviii (1548)/On les vend a Paris en la rue/Neufue Notre Dame a len-/seigne Saint Nicolas:/par Iehan Bon-/fons. 8vo, goth. no. 52.

7. To the tune of: Quand parti de Rivoite.

Chans. spirit. à l'hon. de Dieu, 1596, p. 120.

8. To the same tune is sung: Il est un homme au monde.

Qui veult entrer en grace (63).—*Qui ueult entrer en grace.*

1. Marot, II, 186 (1525).

2. Attaignant, 35 chansons, f. 6 r°.

3. Recueil et Eslite, 267.

4. *De la Fidelité nuptiale* par Gerard de Vivre, *Trois comédies*, 1589, p. 73 (74).

Qu'en dictes vous: ferez vous rien (115).—*Qu'en dictes uous: ferez uous rien.*

Resiouyssez vous mesdames (99).—*Resiouyessesz uous bourgeoises, Belles filles de Lyon.*

Resueillez vous Dame nature (117).—*Resueillez uous Dame nature.*

1. Beaulieu, *Divers Rapports*, 1537, chanson xii.

There are endless songs beginning with Resueillez-vous. Cf. Eitner, *Bibl.*, pp. 644, 646; Picot, *Chants historiques*, pp. 8, 9. In the *Bulletin du protestantisme français*, 1906 (vol. LV), p. 240, there is a song beginning: Reveilles toy, malheureux heretique. Cf. also *Chans. hug.*, I, 20.

Ribon ribaine (155).—*Ribon ribaine,*

Tout en despit de moy.

This is really a refrain, not a song. The song begins:

Mon pere et ma mere

N'auoyent enfant que moy.

1. Plus. belles chans., 1536, no. vii.

2. Plus. belles chans., Lotrian, 1543, f. 10 r°.

3. (Second verse: N'out. . .)

Chardavoine, Recueil, 1588, f. 27 r° (with music).

4. La Fleur des chansons, 1600, p. 296.

Secourez moy mon Dieu, mon seul recours (11).—*Secourez moy ma dame par amours.*

1. Marot, II, p. 175.

2. Recueil et Eslite, 213 r°.

3. Fleur des chansons (1530?), 44.

4. Fleur des chansons, 1537 (Chantilly), H. i v°.

5. Plus. belles chans., Lotrian, 1543, f. lxxxii.

6. Attaignant, 37 chansons, f. i v°.

7. Ronsard, *Meslange*, 1572, f. 7 r°, music by P. de Monté.

8. Chansons nouvellement composées, Vve Buffet, 1557, f. 53 v°, no. 50.

To the same tune is sung:

Au bon Jesus ayons tres tous recours.

Seigneur Jesus i'ay trop meffaict (94).—*Hertz lieb uas han ich dier gethan* (Allemande).

Seulle suis demeurée (128).—*Seulle suis demourée*.

Si en mon coeur i'ay désiré vengeance (104).—*Si de mon coeur malheur a la regeance*.

Si i'ay eu du mal ou du bien (72).—*Si i'ay eu du mal ou du bien*.

Cf. Eitner, p. 354.

Si i'ayme Iesus Christ (76).—*Si i'ayme mon amy*.

1. (Second verse: Trop plus que mon mary)

Gaston Paris, *Chansons françaises du xv^e siècle*, no. 118.

2. Plus. belles chansons nouvelles, about 1520, no. 36, f. cviiij, Rothschild Library Catalogue, IV, 322.

(Second verse: Trop mieulx que mon mery.)

3. Plus. belles chansons, 1537, f. xc.

4. Plus. belles chans., 1543, f. xcviij, v°.

Si ie vy en peigne et langueur (26).—*Si je vy en peine et langueur*.

1. Marot, II, 190 (1528).

2. Recueil et Eslite de plus. belles chans., 1576, 248 r°.

Si ma dolleur me continue (113).—*Si mon malheur me continue*.

Si par souffrir grand penitence et ieusne (45).—*Si par souffrir on peult uaincre fortune*.

1. Attaignant, 42 chansons, f. 8 v°. Cf. Eitner, p. 354.

S'on m'a donné le bruit et renommée (142).—*S'on m'a donné le bruit et renommée*.

Sortez, Sortez (infidelles) (152).—*Dansez, sautez, Damoysselles*.

Sus debout: ne musons tant (129).—*Sus debout beuuns d'autant*.

1. *Chans. hug.*, I, p. 35. (Beaulieu.)

Ta bonne grace, o mon Dieu glorieux (85).—*Ta bonne grace et maintien gracieux*.

Tant dure la Papisterie (109).—*Trop endurer me faict m'ameye*.

Tant que vivray en eage flourissant (89).—*Tant que uiuray en eage flourissant.*

1. Marot, II, 181.

2. Attaignant, 37 chansons, f. 16 v°.

To the same tune are sung:

a. Mon Dieu, mon roy, mon pere.

b. (Second verse: Je servirai le Seigneur tout puissant.) Chans. spirit., 1596, p. 72.

c. Chans. hug., I, p. 22. (Beaulieu.) (Cf. Eitner, p. 356.)

Tristes pensers, ie vous donne la tresue (40).—*Tristes pensers à mes yeulx donnez tresues.*

Vella bon,

Faictes ailleurs ce sermon (134).—*Vella bon,
Faictes ailleurs ce sermon.*

Venez, venez y tous et toutes (151).—*Venez, venez, venez y toutes.*

Vire vire Iehan: vers Dieu ta pensée (136).—*Vire vire Iehan, vire Iehan iehannete.*

1. Attaignant, 31 chansons, f. 15 v°. Music by Courtoys.

To the same tune is sung:

N'allez plus en Bethléem.

Vivray ie tousiours en soucy (121).—*Vivray ie tousiours en soucy.*

1. Attaignant, 37 chans., (153?), f. 5 r°.

Music by Claudin Sermisy. Cf. Eitner, p. 856. (Second verse: Pour vous ma tres loyalle amye.)

2. Fleur des chans. (1530?), 17.

3. Cf. *Farce de Calbain*, Viollet-le-Duc, *Anc. Th., fr.*, II.

4. S'ensuyent plus. belles chans., 1537, f. xli.

5. (Second verse: Pour vous, ma tres loyalle maistresse; probably not the song imitated by Beaulieu, Plus. belles chans., 1543, f. xli.)

Vivre ne puis content sans la presence (33).—*Vivre ne puis content sans la presence.*

Cf. Eitner, p. 361.

1. Chansons spirituelles à l'honneur de Dieu, 1596, p. 283.

Voicy le bon temps (124).—*Voicy le bon temps.*

1. Beaulieu, *Divers Rapports*, 1537, Chanson vii.

2. Paragon des chansons, 1538, f. 9. Transcribed by Becker in his article on Beaulieu. Cf. Bibliography. Cf. also Eitner, 1538, 1.

Vous mocquez vous, moyne de moy (139).—*Vous moquez vous, monsieur de moy?*

1. Chansonier hug., I, 175. (Beaulieu.)

Vos abus sont tous descouuertz (77).—*Vostre cul verd couuert de uerd.*

Vous n'aurez plus de Carolus (139).—*Vous me rendrez mon Carolus.*

Vray Dieu que ton filz eut de peine (9).—*Vray Dieu qu'amoureux ont de peine.*

1. Plasse des Noeux, III 5A. *Bibl. Nat.*, Ms. fr. 22561. Thomas Sibilet cites this triolet in his *Art Poétique*.

1. (Second verse: Certes j'aymeroyz mieux la mort, the version which judging from the rime of Beaulieu's songs he must have imitated.) Ron-sard, *Meslange*, 1572, music by Mouton, f. 60 r°.

2. (Second verse: Par Dieu! j'aymase mieux la mort) *Farce du Vieil amoureux et du Jeune amoureux*, *Recueil de Farces*, Le Roux de Lincy et F. Michel, Paris, Techener, 1880, I, vii, p. 5.

3. (Second verse: Je sçay bien à quoy m'en tenir; apparently not the one used by Beaulieu as a model.) G. Paris, *Chansons du XV^e siècle*, no. 122.

HÉLÈNE J. HARVITT.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

REVIEWS

Le Morte Darthur of Sir Thomas Malory and its Sources. By Vida Scudder.
New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1917. 8vo, pp. ix, 430.

Professor Scudder in her *Le Morte Darthur of Sir Thomas Malory and its Sources* presents what is professedly a popular introduction to, and comment on, the finest early example of modern English prose. So one is surprised on opening the book to find that in Part I (1-173) she has undertaken a task of greater magnitude than the title of the book would imply, nothing less than an exposition of the whole "matière de Bretagne" anterior to the work of Malory. Her review of this important subject is bound to be both instructive and suggestive to the lay mind. But one wonders whether the time has arrived for the specialist in medieval literature to synthesize the detailed work done in the last twenty-five years, an engaging undertaking which calls for a well-balanced discrimination in the selection of the results of the two conflicting schools of Celticists, and a ready hand to prick the inflated balloons of non-Celticists and of amateurs in anthropological studies. Professor Scudder, whose primary interests are in English literature, has shown a misplaced faith in the conclusions of certain investigators in other subjects. To attack their theories, based largely, as they appear in her book, on distorted facts and lapses in information is to make a battlefield of neutral territory—a characteristic of German scholarship as well as of German militarism. But one notes other errors of statement and interpretation, which reveal that sense of unfamiliarity we all feel when garnering in strange fields of erudition. Thus, there is only one instance of the knights of Arthur's court furnishing a theme to sculptors of the twelfth century, and the bas-relief on the northern portal of the cathedral of Modena can not be rightly called Lombard (2). If the statement is correct (167-8) that "in the first half of the twelfth century babies were named after Gawain," most popular of Arthurian heroes in Italy, who were the other Arthurian knights who "gave names to Italian babies in the eleventh century" (2)? With what we know to-day of the music and poetical conceptions of the troubadours, is it well to make a statement which seems to rehabilitate the obsolete idea that "from across the Pyrenees there stole into southern France strains of the soft music dear to the Arabian, and with them the conscious cult of beauty?" (35). It has not been necessary to wait for the publication of Sommer's edition of the *Lancelot* (78) to read in the original text the account of the first kiss which passed between Lancelot and Guenevere, alluded to by Dante (cf. p. 131), but omitted in the printed *Lancelot* and in Malory (214), as the pertinent passage has been traced down, and printed, more than once, in the last fifty years. It is hard to see what authority there is for the statement that the suppression of the "enfances" of Lancelot in Malory is responsible for the common erroneous notion that "literature treating of the child is a modern invention" (125). The real question at issue is missed, namely the fact that the "enfances" of epic and romantic heroes, Achilles, Roland, Guillaume d'Orange,

have been the inventions of the epigoniasts of literature. Professor Scudder insists (36, 51) on finding an identity of sentiment—in its intensity and its spirituality—in the service of love, manifested by the heroes of the narrative French poems of the twelfth century and by the poets of the *dolce stil novo*, while they only have in common the conventionalities of the same artificial love code—but interpreted in ways so diverse by the two groups,—and while in the French creations one finds nothing of the spontaneity and the philosophic background of the Italian group. And one can only wonder at the interpretation and illustration, twice given, of one of the best known episodes in the *Ywain*: “Ywain finds in the forest a golden basin on a tree and striking it evokes a magic storm, as savages still claim to do by beating metal vessels” (43-4, cf. 149-150). Ywain evokes the storm by pouring water on a stone, a rite of imitative magic on which the evidence is overwhelming in savage cult and primitive survival. Beating vessels is one method used to frighten away storm-demons, but for the purpose of inciting storms can any but the magic drums, like those of the Lapps, be cited, which in the hands of wizards are believed to have the power of inflicting almost any type of Schrecklichkeit on one's enemies?

In Part II of her book (77-362) Professor Scudder has not needed to trust to the judgment of others on matters outside of her own field of interest. Her summary of *Le Morte Darthur* is generous enough in outline, in quotation, and in praise to tempt the reader who is a novice in literature to want to know more of the original. One can only commend heartily the way in which she analyses the style of Malory, rich and varying, symbolic and realistic, now grandiloquent, and again pathetic; notes his power in characterization, and originality in giving his own stamp, in a long-breathed evolution, to certain of the heroes; and reveals the unity of conception in a work which gives at the first reading the impression of being a loosely articulated compilation. She shows that the work is not an elaboration, but an intensive compression of the sources, as far as they are known to her; in some cases—as in the story of Tristram—inferior to other earlier forms. But here again a wider acquaintance with medieval literature would have elucidated themes and ideals that are characteristic neither of *Le Morte Darthur*, nor of the literary type of which it is the last worthy representative. Thus Tors, the reputed son of a cowherd, who wishes him to become a knight because he is good for nothing else, “Because always he will be shooting or casting darts, and glad for to see battles and behold knights, etc.” (201-2), is the counterpart of the heroes of the late chansons de geste, of Vivien, Aiol and Hugues Capet; the phials full of the waters of Paradise, with which Priamus, the Saracen knight, heals himself and Gawain (211), has been modelled on the wonderful balm found in late versions of *Fierabras*; and the uncouth gallantry of either Lamorak, the Arthurian knight (237-8), or of the paynim Palomides (244) is an adaptation of that of the rough and ready Renouart, the hero of the late branches of the geste de Guillaume d'Orange; and the ill-omened house of Lot (185, 223, 255) is again an adaptation of the tendency of late chansons de geste to trace the descent of trouble makers and rebels back to Doon de Mayence, which on Italian soil developed into the carefully planned genealogical charts of the traitor house of the Maganzesi.

One must take exception, also, to the more general statements in regard to medieval literature. It is not true that most medieval books are tintured

with mysticism (260). The wonder is that one can hear at all the still small voice of spiritual inspiration in that dark epoch of an unbridled raging Faustrecht—present-day events connote the German phrase with an illuminating force—and confining theological conventionalities. Least of all can hagiology be considered one of those “departments of literature set aside and controlled by mystic and ascetic passion.” A boat can not float higher than the tide which bears it, and the lives of saints were written to suit contemporary taste as much as the cheap fiction of to-day. Very exceptional is the saint's life, in the *Legenda aurea* and in similar collections, which is anything but a repetition of over-worked *clichés*, often taken from popular tradition, attached with variations to this name or that. No doubt “to the outer world, the pilgrim was as familiar as the knight” (264) and, it may be added, had just about as much spiritual influence. The phrase “the troops who passed chanting along the roads of Kent or of Provence, bearing their staff and scrip, impressed imagination indelibly” (264) makes a pretty picture, but any one who has studied in detail the records of medieval pilgrimages knows that they were for the great majority who took part in them pleasure junkets, and reeked just as much of “business” as modern pilgrimages to Breton pardons, to Lourdes, to Lucca or to Ste. Anne de Beaupré.

In Part III (363-409), “Malory and his Sources,” Professor Scudder has worked under the disadvantage of believing that Sommer's studies and publications on this subject were in any way conclusive, instead of being merely tentative, and often erroneous. But nonetheless, there is much that is very much to the point in what she writes of the methods by which Malory makes a whole tale of disjointed odds and ends, and in the comparisons she makes between his work and earlier Arthurian romances of a similar extended scope. There are, further, good pages on the technique of Malory's style, his vocabulary, the charm of his rhythm, although in the discussion of the last subject the statement (395) that “the Middle Ages knew that such a thing existed” and the illustrations given in the way of confirmation, understate both the practise of, and our knowledge of, the use of rhythmical prose in the literature of that period.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

Roncesvalles. Un nuevo cantar de gesta español del siglo XIII. Published by R. MENÉNDEZ PIDAL, *Revista de filología española*, IV (1917), 105-204.

The discovery of a new Old Spanish popular epic is a great event in Hispanic letters. Heretofore only two such have been known in the poetic form given them by medieval scribes.¹ A fortunate find in the Archivo provincial of

¹ Of course, the *Poem of the Cid* and the *Mocedades* or *Crónica rimada*. It is customary to add to the list of extant Old Spanish epics the *Infantes de Lara*, as picked out of the prose chronicles by Pidal (*Inf. de Lara*, 421-432). There is no basis, however, for regarding it as anything more important than an able reconstruction of what the early epic may have been. It must be used with extreme caution for studies in hiatus or meter. The original *gesta* was converted by someone from verse to prose, and by Pidal from prose to verse again. The personal equation entered into many details during this double transfor-

Pamplona adds a third, the existence of which was prophesied by Menéndez y Pelayo (*Antol.*, XII, 367; *Orígenes de la novela*, I, cxxviii). The four-page MS. contains only a fragment of a scant hundred lines, broken off abruptly at beginning and end. With supreme technical skill (for the archivero of Pamplona, even after using reagents, considered the first and last pages indecipherable), Menéndez Pidal has recovered nearly every line of the text. A paleographic copy, photogravures of the MS. and a critical text are given. The script is of the kind used in Navarre-Aragon about 1310. The date of the poem itself the editor sets in the first third of the thirteenth century, but his reasoning is not very firmly based. The language contains Navarrese forms, but none in rime, and Menéndez Pidal believes them scribal, and the poem composed in Castile. The word Roncesvalles does not occur, but the title conferred seems the only appropriate one.

The story contained in the fragment is this: The emperor Carlos, in going over the battlefield [of Roncesvalles], finds the body of the archbishop [Turpin]. He laments over it, and orders his squires to carry it to the dead man's home, in "Flanders[?] la ciudade." He then discovers the corpse of Oliveros, and, addressing it as if it were alive, asks where he may find "Roldán." He sees the results of one of Roland's blows, and then the hero himself, dead and "acostado a un pilare." (Note the paragoric *e*, which appears more regularly than in any other Old Spanish epic.) The emperor laments at length (48 lines) over his nephew; he includes a succinct account of his own early exploits in Spain and the Holy Land, and ends by repeating the oft-expressed wish to accompany Roland in death. He gives an unusual reason for the wish: "d'aquestos muertos que aquí tengo conmigo | dizir me ias las nuevas, cada uno como fizo." The Emperor faints. The last eighteen lines relate how duc Aymón finds the body of his son "Rynalte," addresses it, and orders it removed. The fainting Emperor is then discovered by "el duc Aymon e ese duc de Breytayna | e el cauayllero Beart, el fi de Terryn d'Ardeyna," who dash cold water in his face.

As regards meter, the new poem confirms the theory that the line of the Old Spanish epic had no fixed number of syllables. The belief had been expressed before by Menéndez Pidal with ever increasing conviction (*Cantar de Mio Cid, Elena y María*); and now he exclaims in a note of triumph: "¡Adiós, pues, las ilusiones de los partidarios de la regularidad métrica del *Mio Cid*!" (p. 123). Probably not all the defendants will submit tamely to being read out of court for all time; the reviewer, however, concurs heartily in the statement. His reason is the general principle that a hypothesis must not be used to warp facts, unless the hypothesis itself rests on a basis of fact, not theory. If you wish to emend all the hemistichs of the *Mio Cid* into octosyllables, you must first show extremely good reason for believing that the lines were originally octosyllables. As Menéndez Pidal puts it, in another connection: "Nunca seremos bastante cautos en corregir lo que no comprendemos bien" (p. 121, n. 1).

Roncesvalles also confirms, perhaps definitively, the substitute theory which mation. The doubtful character of the result would appear self-evident, but one may clinch the argument by quoting the admission of Pidal himself (p. 127): "debo advertir que los versos de los *Siete Infantes de Lara* que publiqué en 1896, están reconstruidos con la preocupación de un metro octosilábico."

he first formulated in the study of *Elena y María*.² This theory may be called that of rhythmically alternating frequency of syllables. It applied not only to *cantares de gesta*, but also to certain juglaresque poems in shorter meters, *Elena y María*, *Sta. María Egipcíaca*. If the line (or half-line) of greatest frequency has 7 syllables (as with the hemistichs of *Mío Cid* and *Roncesvalles*), the next commonest will be that of 8, the next of 6, the next of 9, the next of 5, and so on. Space is lacking for further comment on this remarkable law. It is unparalleled, so far as I know, in the metrics of any other tongue. Menéndez Pidal backs it now firmly for the first time, and brings forward figures which once more compel admiration for the scholar who combines in the highest degree concentration upon minutiae of mathematical calculation with abstract coördination. One wonders whether this towering structure of figures is bound tightly together at all the joints, but at least the main facts are indisputable. The lines, as they stand, do show a regular alternation of frequency in *Mío Cid*, in *Roncesvalles*, in the *Mocedades*, even in the *Infantes de Lara*, and the short line poems already cited.

One may well ask, certainly, what conception the juglar had of his art when he composed an ametric poem. Those who versify in lines of fixed length, by conscious effort make their lines conform to that length, whether they do it by means of rime-tags, like Berceo, or whether they contrive to have thought and words occupy the same space, like Juan Ruiz. But what was the mental process of one whose lines vary with alternating frequency? Did he also count his syllables, and see to it that hemistichs of 8 occur barely less often than those of 7, and those of 6 next in order to those of 8? Menéndez Pidal does not touch this point. He would perhaps say: "No, the juglar made no effort to follow a scheme. He did not count his syllables at all, he knew nothing of rhythmic frequency. His only guide was the genius of the language, which told him that a certain norm of length sounded well to his ear, but that he need not conform to it absolutely. Variety within limits was his aim; and the fixed relations of frequency are only results of the law of chance." If this be the case, it is no cause for wonder that the exact sequence is sometimes disturbed.³ One would not expect perfect regularity of alternation.

Menéndez Pidal finds, as previously, that the basis of hemistichs in the *gestas* changed gradually from 7 to 8, not suddenly, nor in obedience to foreign or lyric influences, but in response to "hondas tendencias rítmicas del idioma" (p. 131). A really fixed syllable-count did not invade epic poetry till 1450 (?); the *romances viejos*, as is well known, exhibit much irregularity in length of line. Pidal believes that a formula of 8, "9 can be shown for them also.

A brief section is devoted to synalepha. The conclusion is reached that synalepha does exist in the *Roncesvalles*. Taking this with the recent studies of Espinosa on the *Reyes Magos* (*Rom. Rev.*, VI, 378 ff.) and of Hanssen on the *Alixandre* (*Rev. fil. esp.*, III, 345 ff.), one is convinced that both synalepha and hiatus existed in Old Spanish, but the laws which governed their use are not fully understood as yet. Espinosa and Hanssen show that synalepha and elision

² *Rev. filol. esp.*, I, 94-95, "podemos considerar esa alternativa gradual de decrecimiento y aumento como ley que rige la poesía amétrica de los juglares."

³ As in *Mío Cid* when taken by half-lines. Hemistichs of 9 syllables are less frequent than those of 5, instead of more frequent.

do not occur after a tonic vowel. Menéndez Pidal does not enter into the matter.

The most important contribution to knowledge given us by the editor in his commentary does not lie in the field of metrics, but of comparative literature. *Roncesvalles* aids little, if at all, in clearing up the origins of the native historical epic of Castile, but very much in understanding the epic relations of France and Spain in one branch, the Carolingian matter. That may lead to still more important studies later.

Menéndez Pidal claims that the *romances carolingios* depend directly on Spanish *gestas*, and were not, as Milá and Menéndez y Pelayo supposed, taken in the fifteenth century from French epics, suffering a great and deliberate change at that time. In other words, the "free and intelligent imitation" which Menéndez y Pelayo thought indicated a more highly developed literary spirit than existed in Spain prior to the fifteenth century, "una lengua ya adulta, una literatura nacional ya formada" (*Antol.*, XII, 363), must be referred back to the thirteenth at least.

This claim is proven, to my mind, for the *romance de la fuga del Rey Marsín* (Wolf, *Prim.* no. 183; *Antol.*, IX, 245). Altho it does not cover the same ground as the *Roncesvalles* fragment, the names of the personages show that it bears a close relation to the latter, and may have issued from a lost part of it.⁴ And *Roncesvalles* as well as *Rey Marsín* show a deviation from French sources which cannot be explained except by conscious elaboration. Even the later reworkings of the Roland poem,⁵ which are much more closely allied to *Roncesvalles* than is the Oxford MS., do not account for all the novelties in the fragment; nor is any one of them its exact prototype. These points the editor extorts with penetrating scrutiny. He has no equal in extracting the maximum amount of juice from an undersized orange.

After all, why should one suppose that medieval poets were incapable of originality or art? The statement refutes itself. The *Chanson de Roland* is an art-product of a highly developed type. Tho later, the *Poem of the Cid* is more naïve and unconscious than the *Roland*. But, in Spain, the unknown author of the lost Siege of Zamora *gesta* yields little in point of art to any epic writer: the poet who composed the lament of Gonzalo Gustioz over the heads of his seven sons, the Infantes de Lara, was wholly capable of altering a French epic at will.

It does not follow, however, as Menéndez Pidal seems to imply, that Menéndez y Pelayo was wrong in associating the spirit of the Carolingian ballads in general with the fifteenth century (*Antol.*, XII, 362-3). When he wrote the words to which Pidal takes exception, he had in mind such poems as *Conde Claros*, *Guiomar*, the *Marquis of Mantua*, etc. His brilliant pupil does him a little less than justice in not recalling the complementary statements of *Antol.*,

⁴ While speaking of *la fuga del Rey Marsín*, I must not pass in silence over the explanation (p. 171, n. 1) of the phrase "Alcaria, moros, alcaria," which occurs in that poem. It is one of the famous cruxes of the *romances*. No one has ever made a plausible guess at it, but now D. Julián Ribera finds the Arabic etymon: "alkarr" = "attack."

⁵ The MSS. known as M (= V⁴), C, V (= V⁷), P and T.

XII, 367, and of the *Orígenes*, I, cxxviii. Each romance must be considered by itself, as their histories may, and do, differ widely.

In searching for other ballads besides *Rey Marsín* that may be connected with *Roncesvalles*, Menéndez Pidal has little fortune; poems on that theme are scarce. He investigates *Doña Alda* (*Prim.* 184), and deems it possible that the description of her death may have formed part of *Roncesvalles*, which he considers to have been originally fully as long as the *Mio Cid*. Incidentally he demonstrates beyond peradventure that *Doña Alda* is derived directly or via a Spanish *gesta* from some of the French reworkings of the *Roland*. All previous critics, even M^lla, considered *Doña Alda* a highly original product of Spanish genius, simply for want of going beyond the Oxford MS. to its rimed derivatives.

The editor closes his task with a transcript of certain prose texts dealing with the battle of *Roncesvaux*. The most important is from Lope García de Salazar's *Libro de las bienandanzas y fortunas*, 1471. The famous *Crónica de 1344* itself is conspicuously absent: why? Menéndez Pidal promises a study of the Carolingian themes in general, with especial attention to Bernardo del Carpio. That is a field of rich promise. The present article, then, remarkable as it is, may prove only a prelude to work of still greater importance.

Roncesvalles comes as an interruption and complement to the marvellous studies entitled *Poesía popular y romancero* (*Rev. filol. esp.*, I, II, III). They are all directed toward filling the gap that exists between the Old Spanish *gestas* and the fifteenth century *romances*. "La independencia de los romances respecto de las gestas es una ilusión debida a la falta de textos." These studies are the ripest, most penetrating and most original work of the greatest living Spanish medievalist. By their grasp of detail and of the whole, by their closeness of logic and independence of view, they add fresh laurels to a reputation already supreme in the field.

S. GRISWOLD MORLEY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

NOTES AND NEWS

Professor A. Carnoy, of the University of Louvain, who has been teaching in this country for several years, has accepted a professorship in Romance philology at the University of California.

Professor L. P. Shanks has resigned his assistant-professorship of Romance languages at the University of Pennsylvania to accept a similar position at the University of Wisconsin.

Dr. E. C. Hills has resigned the librarianship of the Hispanic Society to become professor of Romance languages at the University of Indiana, and Dr. Ralph House has resigned his position as Curator of Printed Books at the Hispanic Society to become assistant-professor of Romance languages at the University of Minnesota.

M. Gaston Malécot, who was teaching at Columbia when the war broke out and sailed on the first steamer for France, has returned to the United States. He has accepted the position of professor of Romance languages at the University of Arkansas. Professor Malécot received from the French Republic the Croix de guerre and the Médaille Militaire.

M. Louis Engerand, 103 rue de Rome, Paris, may be consulted for careful and most accurate work in paleography and related studies.

